FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-049
Tuesday
13 March 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-049 *13 March 1990*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'New' Naval Thinking Seen Despite U.S. Stance *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Mar]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov's 12 Mar Briefing on World Issues 2
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Declaration *[TASS]* 2
Nuclear Test Site Decision *[TASS]* 2
U.S. Plans For Seaborne Arms Depots *[TASS]* 2
Israeli Settlement Policy *[TASS]* 2
U.S. Remarks on Libyan Plant *[TASS]* 3
U.S. 'Floating Stockpiles of Weapons' *[Moscow Radio]* 3
TASS Summary 3
UN Representatives Meet To Discuss Cambodia *[TASS]* 4
UN Human Rights Commission Experiences Changes *[PRAVDA 10 Mar]* 4
Western View of Eastern Changes Considered *[PRAVDA 10 Mar]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Subversive Action' Over Sheymov Condemned *[TASS]* 8
'Appreciable Progress' in Chemical Arms Talks *[TASS]* 8
U.S. 'Simulating' Cuts in Military Bases *[PRAVDA 4 Mar]* 9
Soviet-U.S. Tax Agreement Talks To Be Held *[PRAVDA 5 Mar]* 10
Information Exchanges With U.S. To Increase *[TASS]* 10

China

Upcoming PRC Local Elections Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 21 Feb]* 11
Delegation Discusses Trade on PRC Visit *[Moscow TV]* 13

Northeast Asia

Mongolian Party Plenum Continues 13 Mar *[TASS]* 13
Correspondent Reports *[Moscow TV]* 13
IZVESTIYA on Democratic Union's Objectives *[7 Mar]* 14
Article Views Democratic Union Congress *[NEW TIMES 27 Feb-5 Mar]* 14
Mongolian Strikers Reject Government Appeal *[IZVESTIYA 10 Mar]* 16
ROK Minister To Visit CSSR, Bulgaria *[Moscow Radio]* 17

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnam's Nguyen Van Linh on Renewal Process *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 17
Soviet-SRV Intergovernmental Commission Meets *[TASS]* 17
Nguyen Van Linh Receives Gusev *[TASS]* 18
CPSU Auditing Officials Visit SRV, Cambodia *[PRAVDA 2 Mar]* 18
CPV Politburo Member Discusses SRV Economy *[PRAVDA 3 Feb]* 18
Yazov Holds Conversation With SRV Counterpart *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Mar]* 20
TASS, VNA Communications Link Begins *[TASS]* 21

Near East & South Asia

Iranian Official in Damascus To Discuss Hostages *[Moscow International]* 21
Progress of Soviet-Iranian Relations Viewed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 21
TASS Reports Cooperation Meeting With Iran 21
Economic Commission Concludes Work *[TASS]* 22
Tehran Demonstrations by War Refugees Viewed *[Moscow International]* 22
Commentary Discusses Reports on Protests in Iran *[Moscow International]* 23
'Goodwill' Urged in Iran-Iraq Peace Talks *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 23
Vorontsov Talks With Visiting Pakistani Speaker *[IZVESTIYA 3 Mar]* 24
Parliamentarians End Visit 4 Mar *[TASS]* 24
Israeli Communist Party Group Visits Moscow *[TASS]* 25
Arabic, Israeli Understanding Needed on Immigrants *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 25
Commentary Views Shamir's Stance on Middle East *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 25
Palestinian Talks 'Will Permit' Ties With USSR *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 26
Commentator Criticizes Libya's al-Qadhdhafi *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 26
Yakovlev Receives Indian Marxist Delegation *[PRAVDA 7 Mar]* 27
Vorontsov Confers With Bangladesh Ambassador *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* 27
Retiring Ambassador to Jordan Replaced *[IZVESTIYA 26 Feb]* 27

Sub-Saharan Africa

Supreme Soviet Delegation Ends Tanzania Visit *[TASS]* 28
Mandela Completes Working Visit to Tanzania *[Moscow International]* 28

East Europe

First Soviet Troops Depart Hungary 12 Mar *[TASS]* 28
Text of Agreement on Soviet Troop Withdrawal *[Budapest NEPSZABADSAG 11 Mar]* 29
Hungarian Parties Warned on Pace of Withdrawal *[IZVESTIYA 10 Mar]* 29
V.M. Falin Confers With Hungarian Ambassador *[PRAVDA 8 Mar]* 30
Shevardnadze Meets Romanian Foreign Minister *[IZVESTIYA 10 Mar]* 30
Romanian Subway, Mine Workers' Strikes Eyed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Mar]* 30
Message to Bulgarian Leaders on Liberation Day *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 31
Poll Says Most Bulgarians Would Vote for BCP *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Mar]* 31
MOSCOW NEWS Profiles Political Groups *[No. 9]* 31
Bulgarian Sociopolitical Frictions Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Mar]* 35
'Socialist' Dropped From Title of Czech Republic *[PRAVDA 7 Mar]* 36
CSSR's Mohorita on CPCZ's Future Role *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Mar]* 36
Dubcek Urges 'Constructive Development Program' *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 36
Czechoslovak Envoy Received at Foreign Ministry *[IZVESTIYA 12 Mar]* 37

West Europe

Turkish Minister on Economic Ties With USSR *[TASS]* 37
Turkish Trade Protocol Signed in Istanbul *[TASS]* 37
Investigation of Turkish Newsmen Confirmed *[IZVESTIYA 24 Feb]* 37
Adamshin Receives Italian Ambassador Salleo *[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]* 37
Joint Venture With Austria Produces Magazine *[TASS]* 38
Adamishin Holds Talks With Switzerland's Jacobi *[TASS]* 38
Rogachev Meets, Holds Talks With British Aide *[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]* 38
EC Trade Agreement Endorsed in Brussels *[TASS]* 38
Finnish Parliamentary Delegation Visits Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 7 Mar]* 38
Pugo Confers With Finnish Ambassador Talvitie *[PRAVDA 7 Mar]* 39
Zagladin Comments on Finnish Friendship Treaty *[Helsinki International]* 39
Sweden Commits to East Europe Development *[IZVESTIYA 10 Mar]* 39
Soviet Trade Relations With West Examined *[TRUD 2 Mar]* 39

Latin America & Caribbean

Komplektov Talks with Nicaraguan Envoy *[TASS]* 41

Nicaragua Prepares For New Government April 25 41
Sandinistas Remain Politically Powerful *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 28 Feb]* 41
Ortega Demands Contra Disbandment *[TASS]* 42
Ortega Addresses Nation *[TASS]* 42

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev Opens Congress 12 March *[Moscow TV]* 43
Moscow TV Carries Congress of People's Deputies 44
Voting for President Discussed 44
Presidency 'No Simple Matter' 45
Speakers on Presidency 45
'Urgency' in Selecting President 46
Many Support Presidency 47
Presidential Power Discussed 47
Speakers Address Third Congress 12 March 48
Lukyanov on Constitution *[PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 48
Medvedev on Presidential Form *[Moscow TV]* 54
Ligachev on Lithuania, Presidency *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Afanasyev on Political System *[Moscow TV]* 56
Gumbaridze on 'Contradictory' Nature *[Moscow TV]* 58
Vorotnikov Addresses Reform *[Moscow TV]* 58
Congressional Debate on Presidency Reported 59
Political Structure Debated *[Moscow TV]* 59
More on Congressional Debate *[TASS]* 60
Election of President Questioned *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Presidential Power Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Congress Evening Session Proceedings Reviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Congress Participants Hold News Conference *[TASS]* 62
Further on News Conference *[TASS]* 63
Gorbachev Opens 13 March Congress Session *[TASS]* 63
Gorbachev Briefs Congress on Lithuania *[Moscow Radio]* 64
More on Lithuanian Issue *[Moscow TV]* 64
Deputies' Remarks Reviewed 13 March *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Congress Limits Debate, To Vote on Presidency *[TASS]* 66
Interregional Groups Opposes Presidency Bill *[TASS]* 66
Ryzhkov, Bakatin, Gorbachev Named for Presidency *[TASS]* 66
Debate on Presidency in 'Final Stretch' *[Moscow Radio 13 Mar]* 66
Congressional Session 13 March Reviewed *[TASS]* 67

Political & Social

Multiparty System Necessary for Democracy *[IZVESTIYA 10 Mar]* 68
Press Conference on Presidency, Yeltsin *[TASS]* 70
Presidency Per Se Will Not Solve Problems *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 70
Pros, Cons of Presidential System Discussed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No.9]* 71
Yeltsin on Presidency, Economic Reform *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 9]* 73
Yeltsin Criticizes 'Half-Hearted' Reforms *[SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 9 Mar]* 74
Yeltsin Predicts 'Popular Uprising' in USSR *[Rome ANSA]* 76
Yakovlev Says Gorbachev 'Free From Ambition' *[TASS]* 76
Yakovlev Denies Gorbachev 'Hungry for Power' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Mar]* 77
Lukyanov Views Congress Session on Presidency *[Mosow Radio]* 78
BBC TV Interviews Abalkin, Akhromeyev, Stankevich 79
PRAVDA Views Five Years of Perestroyka *[11 Mar]* 80
Democratic Union Holds Unsanctioned Rally *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Reactions to Pre-Election Demonstrations *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 9]* 82
Party Veteran Challenges Multiparty Idea *[PRAVDA 7 Mar]* 83
'Insinuations' About Lenin Trouble His Niece *[PRAVDA 11 Mar]* 84
Unwanted Brezhnev, Suslov 'Works' Up for Sale *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Mar]* 84

Semipalatinsk Radiation Effects Cited *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 85
1.5 Milllion AIDS Cases Predicted by 2000 *[Moscow International]* 86
International Power Association Founded in Moscow *[Moscow TV]* 86
Former Petroleum Refining Minister Fedorov Dies *[IZVESTIYA 5 Feb]* 86
KGB Staffers Deplore Delays in Legislation *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Mar]* 86
Komsomol Reform Body Meets in Novosibirsk *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Constitution Commission Chief of Democratic Party *[Moscow TV]* 87
CPSU 'Democratic Platform' Meets in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 87

Economic

Association Converts to Civilian Production *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Business Leader on Industrial Supply Shortages *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 25 Jan]* 87
Bank Official Describes Gold Trading Operations *[PRAVDA 9 Mar]* 89

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Remarks on Possible Envoy to Moscow *[Vilnius Radio]* 92
Vilnius Radio Carries 12 Mar Supreme Council 92
Second Day Opens 92
Procedural Matters Discussed 93
Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Appeal Adopted 93
Debates Continue, Session Ends 93
Chairman Asks Council To Prepare Gorbachev Appeal *[Vilnius Radio]* 94
Text of Appeal *[Vilnius Radio]* 94
Council Adopts Appeal *[TASS]* 95
Lithuanian Supreme Council Letter to Ryzhkov *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Continuing Ties With USSR, Republics Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 95
Lithuania Adopts Decree on Military Service *[Vilnius International]* 96
Lithuanian Supreme Council Issues Appeals 96
To Peoples of USSR *[Vilnius Radio]* 96
To Lithuanian National Communities *[Vilnius Radio]* 96
To Lithuanians *[Vilnius Radio]* 96
Landsbergis Views Reaction to Lithuanian Events *[Vilnius Radio]* 97
Brazauskas Says Independence Decree Too Hasty *[Moscow International]* 97
Gorbachev Aide Urges Political Solutions *[Moscow International]* 97
Landsbergis Hopeful of Ties With Czechoslovakia *[Prague CTK]* 98
Vilnius Radio Carries 11 Mar Supreme Soviet 98
Chairman Candidates Nominated 98
Brazauskas Speaks 98
Landsbergis Speaks 99
Landsbergis Elected 99
Further on Vote 100
Declaration Read 100
Session Agenda Adopted 100
Name Change Adopted 101
Other Changes Discussed 101
Greetings Conveyed 102
Landsbergis Reads Appeal to World 103
Supreme Council Issues Act on Independence *[Vilnius International]* 104
Polish Parliamentarians Congratulate Lithuania *[Warsaw PAP]* 104

Western Republics

Nationalists Urge Independence Party in Ukraine *[AFP]* 104
Ukrainian Trade Union Paper To Be Published *[Moscow Radio]* 105
Ukrainian Religious Paper Published *[Kiev International]* 105
Donetsk Rally Addresses Current Issues *[IZVESTIYA 26 Feb]* 105

'New' Naval Thinking Seen Despite U.S. Stance

PM1203155190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Mar 90 First Edition p 5

[Rear Admiral Professor G. Kostev article: "They Want to Maintain Superiority; Difficult Path to Increasing Confidence and Stability at Sea"]

[Text] Given all the complexity of the disarmament problem, mankind is nonetheless making progress along this path. Thanks to prevailing common sense, the overall political climate is improving, and military tension between East and West is decreasing. But there is still a long way to go to achieve substantial results in the disarmament sphere. In certain directions there is no progress at all, above all as far as naval cuts are concerned. Meanwhile, the situation is such that the risk of military confrontation is great both on land and at sea. Failing to extend confidence-building measures and reduce military activity at sea means turning the world's ocean into a source of the greatest danger to mankind.

Who is preventing the start of talks on naval arms? Primarily the United States. Why? Because the United States is allegedly a naval power which virtually has the divinely ordained right to maintain order on the world ocean. Strange logic. But it is precisely what guides Washington when it refuses point blank to approach the problem of military balance at sea with the same yardstick with which the negotiating sides approach parity on land.

This cannot fail to cause alarm in the Soviet Union. After all, U.S. naval superiority is impressive. In terms, what is more, of means designed for implementing specifically offensive plans. Whatever we are told about the defensive functions of the U.S. Navy, that it is supposedly meant to defend trade communications, there is no doubt about their true purpose. What can be the purpose of these operational fleets, based around nuclear-capable carrier groups? Are the powerful amphibious forces capable of sending 40,000 fully equipped marines overseas simultaneously, formed for defensive purposes? And what about missile-carrying strike groups armed with Tomahawk cruise missiles with a range of 2,800km?

Let us take the latter. After all, we do not have even one-tenth of the U.S. potential here. The combat characteristics of sea-launched cruise missiles [SLCM] are extremely impressive. Its capacity for long-range use both in nuclear and conventional form makes the SLCM a new and very dangerous form of strategic offensive weapon, which is destabilizing the situation not only at sea, but also in the world as a whole.

Washington says that a cut in SLCM's cannot be verified and so, it claims, there is nothing to be done about it. This argument is no more than an excuse. By the way, even among U.S. representatives well versed militarily and politically there are those who see verification as a purely technical aspect of the problem. That is, something which cannot be a reason for the stalemate in reaching an agreement. Especially as the joint Soviet-U.S. experiment in the Black Sea carried out last year confirmed the possibility in principle of verifying the presence of nuclear weapons on board a ship. Of verifying it, what is more, not only by direct contact but also from a certain distance, with verification officers located not on the ship but in a helicopter, for instance.

Overall, if there were goodwill and a desire to take a sober look at matters, then the talks process would encompass the navies as well. But it is just this which is lacking. The U.S. position in the naval arms sphere was defined for today very clearly: to work toward a situation in which the Navy remains a means by which it can operate from a position of strength.

Of course, past inertia and the fetters of the old thinking are very strong, and this cannot fail to be taken into account. But, taking into account the interests of all mankind and its active struggle for survival, it can be assumed that progress will be achieved by international efforts also on questions of confidence-building measures and stability at sea.

Precisely such thoughts and words were heard at the first international seminar on problems of limiting the naval arms race and cutting naval activity in the world's oceans, which was held in Moscow 6-10 February 1990.

More than 100 people from more than 40 countries all over the world expressed their own personal opinion during the seminar. From the content of the speeches it can confidently be asserted that a new kind of naval thinking has emerged for the first time on a large, international scale. The seminar participants' common position, that the limitation of military activity and arms reduction on land cannot be separated from the same process at sea, was the essence of it.

Gerasimov's 12 Mar Briefing on World Issues

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Declaration

LD1203171790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1628 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Mar (TASS)—Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, speaking today at a briefing, answered a number of questions connected with the adoption by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet of a declaration giving elected parliamentary deputies of the republic a mandate to restore a Lithuanian state.

In particular, he pointed to the fact that at today's session, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies "organized a commission to consider the consequences of that decision, which may be serious."

From the practical point of view, continued the diplomat, "a mass of difficult problems arises, as well as demands proceeding from opposite directions, both from the union and from the republic." "From the point of view of the economy," added Gennadiy Gerasimov, "at the moment, Lithuania cannot stand independently 'on its own feet,' if only because it obtains oil and gas supplies at subsidized prices." He recalled in this connection that the price for a tonne of oil, which Lithuania buys for 30 rubles, comes to $110 on the international market.

In connection with the latest decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, continued Gennadiy Gerasimov, national problems also arise, since 20 percent of the population of that republic is composed of citizens of non-Lithuanian nationality.

In reply to a request to comment upon the U.S. Government statement in connection with the decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, Gennadiy Gerasimov stated that, for the time being, he is leaving "that statement to the conscience of the U.S. Administration."

In reply to the question whether there had been any private conversations concerning Lithuania between the Soviet Government, the United States and other members of NATO, he noted that such discussions had not been carried out since it is an internal issue of the USSR. "If other countries tell us what to do, then that may be characterized as interference in the internal affairs of our country," the Soviet diplomat said. Until now, he added, other states—both in Scandinavia and the United States—traditionally not recognizing the inclusion of the Baltic republics in the Soviet Union in 1940, have nevertheless refrained from "any kind of advice and direct interference in this situation," which has also been acknowledged by the Soviet Union.

The USSR Foreign Ministry representative also expressed the opinion that the latest decisions of the Lithuania Supreme Soviet present Western countries too "with a very unpleasant judicial problem," namely "to recognize or not to recognize, and so forth." "I do not think that they are very happy about that," Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

Nuclear Test Site Decision

LD1203155190 Moscow TASS in English 1529 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS—The final decision as to the location of future nuclear tests and their number has not yet been taken, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today. He was commenting on reports in the West that the USSR decided to hold all nuclear tests on Novaya Zemlya, and not at the Semipalatinsk range.

The spokesman said the Soviet Union supports ending all nuclear tests and is prepared to start, without delay, negotiations with the United States to conclude a treaty on their full banning. The Soviet Union also favours solving this problem on a multilateral basis, Gerasimov said.

U.S. Plans For Seaborne Arms Depots

LD1203163290 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS—"The deployment of new floating weapons depots close to European coasts would give NATO boundless weapons reserves for possible use in Europe," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today. He commented on reports appearing in the American press about the Pentagon's plans to increase the number of ships that are to be used as storage facilities for military hardware and armaments.

"It is noteworthy that the Pentagon intends to deploy new squadrons of such ships close to Europe," Gerasimov stressed. He said that these plans were directly linked with the outcome of the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional armaments in Europe. Their implementation would mean the by-passing of the future Vienna treaty, Gerasimov pointed out.

Israeli Settlement Policy

LD1203172390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Mar (TASS)—Arye Levin, head of the Israeli consular delegation in Moscow, was invited to the USSR Foreign Ministry today, where a representation was made to him in connection with the Israeli authorities' intention to use immigrants, including some from the Soviet Union, to settle the occupied Arab territories. This was announced at a briefing by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Department.

The representation, he said, points out that the Soviet Union calls upon the Israeli Government to immediately stop the policy and practice of settling the occupied

territories, including East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, and to give precise assurance that it will not use the immigrants arriving in the country for these purposes.

Regarding the statement made on 8 March by David Levi, Israel's minister of construction and housing, in connection with plans to build 4,000 houses and apartments on the West Bank, the Soviet diplomat commented that "certain circles in Israel are blatantly setting out to violate the norms of international law, and are intentionally erecting obstacles to a peaceful settlement in the Near East." "The Soviet Union decisively condemns these lawless actions," Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed. "We are counting on the fact that the forthcoming session of the UN Security Council, at which the issue of Israeli policy on the occupied territories will be examined, will serve as a serious warning for Israel and will encourage it to review its obstructionist position."

U.S. Remarks on Libyan Plant

LD1203181190 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS--People in the Soviet Union are indignant at U.S. officials' statements, which do not rule out the use of force against the Libyan pharmaceutical enterprise in Al-Rabitah that allegedly produced chemical weapons, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

This contravenes the tendency, now prevailing in the world, towards peaceful settlement of disputes and respect for the sovereignty of states, Gerasimov noted.

The Soviet spokesman said that the Soviet Union appreciated the fact that Libya officially praised the Soviet-American statement on chemical weapons, made during U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's visit to Moscow.

Tripoli also expressed readiness to sign the international convention to ban chemical weapons.

"All this creates a sound basis for a political settlement of disputes and for dispelling possible doubts," Gerasimov noted.

He expressed hope that the American side would not deviate from this approach because fanning tension around Libya is not consistent with anyone's interests". [end quotation marks as received]

U.S. 'Floating Stockpiles of Weapons'

LD1203211190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Remarks by Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, at a news conference held at the Foreign Ministry Press Center on 12 March—recorded]

[Text] Levi, the Israeli minister of housing construction, made a statement on 8 March, from which it follows that his ministry is developing plans to construct houses and apartments on the West Bank for the settlement of immigrants arriving in Israel. The statement indicates quite clearly how much the Israeli Government's official explanations about not encouraging the settlement of immigrants in occupied Arab territories are worth. This is a graphic new confirmation that certain circles in Israel are setting out to blatantly infringe upon the spirit and letter of international legal norms, and are intentionally erecting obstacles in the way of a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union decisively condemns these lawless actions by Tel Aviv. We are counting on the forthcoming sitting of the United Nations Security Council—at which the issue of Israeli policy on the occupied territories will be examined—to serve as a serious warning for Israel, and we will encourage it to review its obstructionist position.

Another announcement: The U.S. press is talking about the Pentagon's plans to increase the number of vessels specially designed for the storage of heavy military equipment and weapons.

At the moment several squadrons of such storage vessels serve as floating depots for the U.S. mobile forces. If the situation becomes acute, each squadron is capable of supplying all the necessary equipment and weapons for a major expeditionary formation, and to provide back up for its combat operations.

The Pentagon proposes to deploy new squadrons of storage vessels near Europe. In this context, the discussion of plans for increasing the number of these specialized vessels is being directly linked to the outcome of the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe. An undertaking on establishing limits to the numbers of weapons located on the territory of the European continent is being discussed in Vienna. Everyone agrees that such limits must be set in a future treaty. The plans for deploying new vessels—floating stockpiles of weapons—would allow NATO to have unlimited reserves of weapons for potential use in Europe.

In our view, should these plans be implemented, they would signify an evasion of a future Vienna treaty.

TASS Summary

LD1203201590 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS—Addressing a briefing today, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov was asked to comment on the adoption by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet of a declaration empowering the deputies of the Lithuanian Parliament to restore the Lithuanian state.

The spokesman said, among other things, that the Congress of People's Deputies at today's meeting "set up a commission to look into the decision's implications, which may be serious."

Gerasimov said that the decision raised a host of difficult legal, economic and national problems.

Asked to comment on the statement by the U.S. Administration in connection with the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Decision, Gerasimov said that, for the moment, he leaves "this statement to the conscience of the U.S. Administration."

Touching upon some Western reports on the Soviet decision to transfer all nuclear tests from the Semipalatinsk nuclear test range to Novaya Zemlya, Gerasimov said that "the Soviet Union has not yet passsed any final decision on where and what nuclear tests to conduct over the next few years."

The proposal of the Soviet Government on a programme for nuclear tests over the next few years, as well as the location of the test ranges are currently being discussed by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Gerasimov expressed the Soviet Union's indignation over the U.S. Administration's intentions to use force against a Libyan pharmaceutical firm in al-Rabitah that is allegedly manufacturing chemical weapons. He said that such a position contradicted the current international trend towards a peace settlement of conflicts and respect for the sovereignty of states.

Gerasimov also said that leader of the Israeli consulate group in Moscow, Arieh Levin, was summoned to the Soviet Foreign Ministry today, where he was given a presentation in connection with Israel's intention to settle immigrants, including those from the Soviet Union, on occupied Arab territories.

Gerasimov said that the presentation contained a call on the Israeli Government to immediately stop settling occupied Arab territories, including East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, and to give clear-cut assurances that it will not use arriving immigrants for this purpose.

The spokesman denied Western press reports that the Soviet Union is stockpiling chemical weapons in the German Democratic Republic. "The Soviet Union has never handed over its chemical weapons to anyone and that means that the GDR has no Soviet chemical weapons on its territory," he said.

Gerasimov also described as groundless the allegations that the Soviet Union intended to deploy its troops withdrawn from Czechoslovakia in the Soviet Baltic republics. He said that the USSR had decided not to station these troops in the Soviet Baltic region.

UN Representatives Meet To Discuss Cambodia

LD1203161690 Moscow TASS in English 0729 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Paris March 12 TASS—A two-day meeting of representatives of the United Nations Security Council's five permanent member-nations—the Soviet Union, the United States, China, France and Britain—begins in the French capital today. It will deal with a search for ways to settle the problem of Cambodia.

The French press emphasises that the forum has been called following the Jakarta informal meeting, at which attempts were made to find a solution to the problem.

The forum is expected to contribute to unblocking the current situation and to carry on the process launched at the Paris international conference on Cambodia in August last year.

UN Human Rights Commission Experiences Changes

PM1303095390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent I. Melnikov: "Emotions Are No Sin"]

[Text] Geneva—Auditorium No. 22 in Geneva's Palais des Nations is the place of permanent "registration" of the UN Human Rights Commission. In the late seventies and the first half of the eighties it was the visible embodiment of the "ideological front," its "front line." The voice of the Soviet delegation resounded assertively, receiving the support of the majority, when it protested against Pinochet's terror, against the atrocities of the Israeli military on Arab land, and against apartheid in the Republic of South Africa. But often something different would occur. The topics of the Afghan war or the exile of Academician Sakharov would be put on the agenda and then the delegation would have to retreat to the defensive.

And again the same spacious oval auditorium. The tables with the delegations' name plates are as before fanned out in a semicircle. But their number has increased markedly: New member countries have appeared, as have observers from nongovernment organizations.

But the main changes are in the content and style of the commission's work. Quite recently there was a clear "division of labor": The West would speak exclusively of civil and political rights, the East of social and economic rights. Now approaches have come markedly closer. The idea of the interconditionality and indivisibility of human rights is encountering increasing recognition. After all, civil and political rights and liberties are emasculated if a person is poorly protected economically and socially. And, conversely, if people's civil and political activity is restricted, man himself and the economy and the social life of society as a whole suffer.

And as a result of the rapprochement aggression and outbursts of temper are encountered increasingly rarely in debates. Here is how Feliks Stanevskiy, head of the USSR delegation, commended on this trend in a talk with me:

"What are the participants in the discussions leaving behind? Let us recall the recent situation. We attacked the West with drawn swords, utterly failing to compare the situation in our own home with the situation "in their home." There was just one task: causing the greatest propaganda harm to the opposite side. The West not only responded blow for blow. On the contrary, knowing our shortcomings and errors, it was often the first to attack. The result was a theater of the absurd—diplomats on both sides were lined up, so to speak, but did not operate to restore flouted rights but to tread on their partners' toes as much as possible...."

A correct observation. At least the propagandist "knife fight" did not discredit the work of this UN commission. I think its authority was preserved thanks to the efforts of the majority of member countries to eliminate the flagrant violations of human rights in the citadel of apartheid and to curb the mass repressions of dictatorial regimes.

"It is true that it is still too early to say that negative practice is a thing of the past," the head of our delegation believes. "There are eruptions and sometimes prolonged periods of confrontation at the sessions. And the present session began stormily. The positions of the U.S. and Cuban representatives clashed during the discussion of problems of self determination."

And nonetheless confrontation no longer "calls the tune." During talks with diplomats who have worked for many years in the UN Human Rights Commission I sensed their sincere desire to put the work of this forum on a serious footing. You must understand, I was told persuasively by the head of the delegation of one West European country, that we represent states and not television or radio companies. That means that the style of our work should be one of solid negotiation. In our contacts and discussions we embody interstate—and my interlocutor stressed the word—interstate dialogue. As a diplomat I virtually never use propaganda terms in talking with my Soviet counterparts. And I do not understand why at a forum in which professional diplomats are taking part concepts and definitions are occasionally uttered from the dictionary of the propaganda services—for instance, "monstrous," "barbaric," or "tyrannical" regime. Or the epithet "totalitarian" is applied to a state where hundreds of millions of people live.

In the corridors of the session, I frequently asked my interlocutors: For all the desire for the painstaking working through of problems, the actual topic of discussion itself—human rights—probably cannot fail to generate emotions and consequently a certain share of partiality. Yes, they agreed, it is hard to avoid emotional coloring and it is not worth trying to do so. But one of them noted: It is essential to have a correct idea of the role of nongovernment participants and official delegations. It is the nongovernment delegations which can create the emotional tone in which serious, professional talk will take place. Heated emotions are no sin. They guide diplomats and make them "get a move on."

What else was memorable about the session which has just ended? The question of the occupied Arab territories was just as keen. The most important avenue of work remained the struggle against apartheid, although in the light of the changes in South Africa the nature of the discussion of the situation in this region was markedly changed. A negative trend also emerged at the session. Behind the "scenes" of the forum it was openly stated that confrontation between North and South.

Of course, questions connected with human rights in the Soviet Union and the East European countries and also in the West remained on the agenda. But they were put differently from before. In this field the discussion acquired a new quality. There was criticism, as before, but now it was constructive. In addition critical remarks were heard more frequently not in the auditorium but were set forth in a businesslike way during bilateral contacts, which have been continuous throughout the session.

Western View of Eastern Changes Considered

PM1203110590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Gennadiy Vasilyev under the rubric "View from Moscow": "Changes in the East and the West"]

[Text] Without tearing its eyes away, the West is looking to the East. Perestroyka in the USSR and the dramatic changes in the East European countries are giving rise to floods of newspaper commentaries, protracted hearings in parliaments, and heated debates at public forums. "Communism is collapsing. East Europe is turning toward a market economy and Western values," political scientists are stating. Statesmen are estimating how these events will affect the military-political situation in Europe. Businessmen are discussing the question of what opportunities and dangers are promised them by the expansion of trade and economic relations with that part of the world. Diplomatic departments are relocating their forces.

"In order not to lag behind the broad changes which are sweeping East Europe," THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "the Bush administration is planning to relocate substantial diplomatic resources—up to 200 U.S. diplomats and operational funds whose total will ultimately reach millions of dollars—from West Europe to the countries which used to be under Soviet control and are now switching from communism to a pluralist democracy and free market economy."

Well, I think we will survive the way the West interprets the stormy process of renewal in the USSR and East Europe. After all we too have been guilty of a simplified,

black and white view of the world. How here can we fail to recall the late twenties and early thirties, the period of the great crisis when we predicted the speedy death of capitalism with no less enthusiasm. We shall withstand the propaganda storm. It is something else which is more important: the Western capitals' real policy with regard to East Europe, the way in which people there conceive of the process of the formation of new political, economic, and military structures.

I realize that trying to set everything in order is a thankless task. But I think that the variant political readings in the West with regard to the changes in the East ultimately come down to two "schools of thought." The first proceeds from the need to consider the interests of all sides and their most rational possible combination. The second is aimed at acquiring one-sided advantages. The supporters of the first line are oriented toward creating an all-European home in which both East and West would find a fitting place. The latter think in geopolitical terms according to which states and systems have struggled and will continue to struggle for a "place in the sun." Their methods are also correspondingly different. Whereas the supporters of the all-European process are in favor of cautious, circumspect actions and gradual advance toward their goal, the latter are not averse to going for broke.

These two trends, now in conflict, now interwoven, are displayed in many fields of West-East relations: in politics, the economy, and military-strategic questions. They were revealed clearly in a question which has emerged to the fore of European political life—the question of Germany's unification. In my view the policy proclaimed so vigorously by Bonn is the desire to acquire one-sided advantages as rapidly as possible. It is not for nothing that it is called the "political blitzkrieg" plan. What does it have in mind? First the de facto subordination of the GDR's economy to the West German mark through a currency alliance. Then the united Germany will become a NATO member. Assurances that there will be no NATO troops on the territory of East Germany are not particularly reassuring, especially as FRG Chancellor H. Kohl has persistently refused to recognize the inviolability of the border along the Oder and Neisse. It seems to some people that the complex issues connected with the advance toward German unification can be resolved at a stroke and with immediate political advantage to themselves. Essentially an attempt is being made to drastically alter the balance of forces in Europe. Of course, no one will cast doubt on the right of the Germans of the GDR and the FRG to decide their own fate. But nor can we deny the right of European states to have a guarantee that a united Germany, if it is created, will not be a threat to them, that it will not raise the question of recarving the European borders, that fascism will not be resurrected in it.

In speaking of the West's attitude toward the changes in the East, we must bear in mind that there is a great diversity of opinions both within individual countries and between them. For instance, France or Britain are both rather restrained not to say cautious about the prospect of the creation of a united German state.

The Soviet Union's position was clearly set forth in the materials relating to M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with the GDR Government delegation headed by H. Modrow. We are firmly convinced that the rapprochement of the GDR and the FRG will only avoid destroying the balance of interests on the continent if there is a guarantee of its gradual, controlled nature, a guarantee that it will be linked with the safeguarding of the security of all states involved within the mainstream of the European process. An essential condition for movement toward a united Germany is full consideration for the rights and interests of the four powers and of other states, especially neighboring ones, and the unconditional recognition of the European borders which now exist. It was also stated most specifically that it is intolerable that a future Germany be included in NATO, whatever reservations may be made here.

The underlying changes in East Europe are preoccupying not only politicians of the Old World. The development of events is being followed with unremitting attention on the other side of the ocean. History has willed it that the United States become a natural part of the European international law structure. The United States' collaboration with the Soviet Union, particularly in the field of arms reduction, has already played an important part in normalizing the international situation and it promises major new steps on the path toward a more secure, nonviolent world. All that is so. But inasmuch as we are speaking of two approaches in the West toward the changes in the East, I believe it necessary also to note something else. I have in mind relapses of the old, strong-arm thinking, the attempts to exploit the difficulties of the Warsaw Pact countries to acquire one-sided advantages.

It is precisely this approach which emanates from the speech delivered by General C. Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, at a U.S. Congress commission. Here is what he said in setting forth the Pentagon's view of the changing military balance of forces in Europe: "The situation in Europe is changing rapidly, changing for the better. It is clear that the Warsaw Pact is disappearing before our eyes as a real and present military threat...." But if that is so, then the United States will have new opportunities to reduce military expenditure, especially as the country's internal needs are insistently demanding this. That means that new steps can be taken toward the Soviet Union, which is unilaterally reducing its armed forces, and that the levels of military confrontation in Europe can be rapidly and substantially reduced. By no means, Powell believes. "The uncertainty in the East," he said, serves as grounds for in no circumstances reducing the $300 billion military budget put forward by the administration.

I think, however, that it is not this approach which now dominates East-West relations. The principles of the

balance of interests and equal security asserted in international life are receiving increasing recognition. A notable fact is that the analysis of the changes taking place in the East European countries and the USSR and of the prospects for the development of relations between East and West became one of the central issues discussed during the recent session of the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly in Strasbourg. The main conclusion reached by those taking part in the Council of Europe Parliamentary Session was that the success of perestroyka in the USSR and the positive development of events in the East European countries accord with the West's interests. "After all, if the implementation of reforms is too painful," one document adopted at the session says, "the process of transformations may be reversed as the result of a counterrevolution, whose results would be catastrophic for the whole continent."

The ice of the cold war is melting. Seemingly strong regimes are collapsing. "Undisputed truths" are growing obsolete. The world is in motion. And the development of thought often lags behind the pace of changes. I think that those people in the West who are trying to use the East's difficulties for their own one-sided advantage are thinking in terms of the outgoing era—the period of armed confrontation, ideological antagonism, and a "from a position of strength" policy. They are guided by an old truth, seemingly verified by history—the winner is the one who strengthens his position at his opponent's expense and a gain for one side is unfailingly a loss for the other. But it can also be the case that both sides either gain or lose. In the age of universal interdependence and nuclear threat this is becoming the rule rather than the exception.

The world has changed because we have changed. The deideologization of interstate relations, the priority of general human values, the right of all peoples to self determination—these are not propaganda slogans but practical guidelines for our foreign policy today. Man, who is living through crucial years, has seen prospects opened up before him which not so long ago seemed inconceivable: a world structure based on unity in diversity, on the supremacy of law over force, on cooperation in resolving common global problems. It would be a historical tragedy to fail to use this unique opportunity.

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Subversive Action' Over Sheymov Condemned

LD1303095490 Moscow TASS in English 0942 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Washington March 13 TASS—The Soviet Union's charge d'affaires ad interim in the United States S. Chetverikov made the following statement at a news conference in the Soviet Embassy here on Monday:

In connection with a series of publications in U.S. mass media regarding the press conference on March 2 involving former employee of the Committee for State Security Victor I. Sheymov, and his CBS interview on March 5, the USSR Embassy in Washington, D.C., has been authorised to state as follows:

Victor Ivanovich Sheymov, born in 1946, native and citizen of the USSR, did indeed work at some point within the system of the Committee for State Security. After graduating from the Bauman Technical School in Moscow as a mechanical engineer, he was employed by the KGB as a coding equipment maintenance technician. His responsibilities, however, allowed him no access to serious secret information, including documents.

On May 16, 1980, Viktor I. Sheymov, his wife and their five-year- old daughter disappeared in Moscow, and search for them in the USSR territory was inconclusive. The competent Soviet authorities ascertained that the Sheymovs did not cross any of the checkpoints at the Soviet border.

Comparing those facts with the U.S. press accounts about Sheymov and with his own statements about the circumstances surrounding his family's clandestine exit from the USSR, one can contend that what is involved here is an unprecedented—in practice of relations among states—subversive action by the U.S. intelligence involving a smuggling out of a Soviet family, and a gross violation of rules of international law, which is, in fact, an act of state terrorism.

There is no doubt that those who organised and carried out this action were directly involved in the attempts to call attention to the Sheymov story through mass media, in an apparent pursuit of the objectives which run counter to the dynamic process of normalisation of U.S.-Soviet relations emerging during the years of perestroika.

Not only the very fact of this hostile action, but also the statements which were put into Sheymov's mouth by the Central Intgelligence Agency, have been received in the Soviet Union with clear puzzlement.

Totally untenable and malicious from beginning to end is his assertion about the Committee for State Security's involvement in the affair relating to the attempt on Pope John Paul II's life. The absurdity of this accusation is all the more obvious in view of the fact that the C.I.A. leadership know very well that the KGB had not and could not have anything to do with this heinous crime. Otherwise, in the course of the well-known Rome trial could the U.S. intelligence ignore the testimony of such a "witness" as Sheymov who as it asserts was already in its hands at that period?

Hints about the KGB's involvement in organising the attempt on the life of the late President Ziaul Haq of Pakistan can also be described as wild fiction. Where on earth could Sheymov have got this so-called information, for at that time he was in the United States, and was it not perhaps the C.I.A. that he turned for information to?

Just like any lie, this C.I.A. fake involving Sheymov has "short legs", which once again demonstrates what kind of unsavory activities that organisation is engaged in, and its unscrupulous ploys.

'Appreciable Progress' in Chemical Arms Talks

LD1203155790 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 12 Mar 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS—The 14th round of bilateral Soviet-American consultations to ban chemical weapons has ended in Geneva, having made appreciable progress.

The sides continued their work on a bilateral agreement to scale down the Soviet and American chemical weapon stockpiles to equally low levels. Such an agreement will prove the Soviet and American desire to prohibit the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons on a world-wide scale. It will contribute to their quick elimination throughout the world and provide definite experience for further chemical disarmament.

The September 1989 Soviet-American memorandum on bilateral supervision experiment and data exchange is of substantial importance for strengthening mutual confidence. In keeping with it, the last round of consultations produced an agreement on mutual inspection visits to concrete objectives—chemical factories, chemical weapon plants and storages. This testifies to the desire of both sides to promote reciprocally openness in the military sphere.

Soviet-American cooperation has made one more step towards developing technologies and procedures for safely destroying chemical weapons without causing economic or ecologic damage. An agreement was reached to exchange visits to corresponding Soviet and American objectives.

The [words indistinct] have continued work on joint proposals that will be submitted to participants in multilateral negotiations. Having discussed technical aspects, linked with yet unresolved aspects of the draft international convention to ban chemical weapons, the

delegations have drawn up during the last round some concrete proposals on ways to destroy chemical weapons and objectives linked with their production.

The joint Soviet-American plan of action, adopted early this year during James Baker's visit to Moscow in order to step up the drafting of a multilateral convention, is being implemented. Due account for each other's stands, the elaboration of a bilateral agreement to destroy chemical arsenals, joint proposals to be submitted to a future multilateral forum and the elaboration of ways to render each other assistance in eliminating these dangerous weapons—these steps establish a useful precedent for cooperation between the USSR and the United States in reducing the war threat. This experience should be extended to otner spheres of arms control as well.

U.S. 'Simulating' Cuts in Military Bases

PM0503135190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Gennadiy Zafesov article under the rubric "View From Moscow": "Cosmetic Environment"]

[Text] It is now often said in East and West that the "cold war" is a thing of the past. This claim is, on the whole, not doubted. Nor is there any doubt about the fact that by no means all the obstacles that built up during the "cold war" years have begun to disappear. I am referring to military bases located on other states' territories.

We were not the initiators of this. After the war, our country focused its efforts on restoring the ravaged economy. The United States, our ally in the anti-Hitler coalition, started setting up a network of military bases around the world. For what purpose were they intended? Against whom are they aimed today? The answer is straightforward. Against us. Retaliatory measures were taken by our side, too.

Bases on foreign territory are one of the main components in the confrontation between the two social systems. For many years this seemed customary somehow. Like a chronic disease which is hard to cure. The change in the world political climate inspired hope that attitudes to bases would change, too. Has this happened? To a certain extent, yes. Now not only politicians but military men are saying that in current conditions bases are becoming obsolete.

It seems to me that this approach is highly realistic and will pay nothing but economic, political, and moral dividends. At any event, it is hard to find assertions to the contrary at the moment. The question, in my view, is how sincere are the sides' intentions. Put simply, are words in line with deeds or not?

Let me start with the U.S. side, which, incidentally, has 125 foreign military bases. Judging by recent press reports their number should fall in the very near future, but... Let's not be too quick to applaud. At the U.S. airbase at Greenham Common (Berkshire) it is planned to cut the number of servicemen from 1,700 to 300. The reduction has been caused by the withdrawal of cruise missiles under the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, but the base will by no means cease to exist. The base at Fairford (Gloucestershire) will be turned into a reserve base. And six KC-135 tankers will be redeployed to the base at Mildenhall (Suffolk). There is no confirmation of the report that nine other aircraft have been sent to the United States. The squadron of F-16's based at Bentwaters (Suffolk) is being redeployed to the FRG. In this regard the weekly TRIBUNE writes that the U.S. Administration's intention to close a number of bases on British territory "should not be overestimated."

It would seem obvious that the withdrawal of U.S. missiles from the British base at Greenham Common is a positive move. A Soviet-U.S. treaty has been concluded and carried out. But reality leaves no room for starry-eyed idealism. According to a report in Britain's THE SUNDAY CORRESPONDENT, the United States plans to site 160 new nuclear missiles in Britain—that is, more than have been withdrawn. Moreover, these missiles will be more modern. According to figures provided by this newspaper, there is a plan to site 450 air-launched nuclear missiles in Europe. In short, they are acting on the principle of "nature abhors a vacuum." This prompts the reasonable question of what is going on—elimination or modernization? The White House maneuvers are reminiscent of the actions of a not overly skilled makeup artist.

The military-political line so clearly visible with regard to the U.S. bases in Britain is nothing exceptional. It seems that this is just an element—albeit a very important element—in Washington's global strategy. At least the situation with regard to U.S. bases in other countries provides quite convincing confirmation of that.

In other parts of the world the United States is rather simulating the abandonment of its foreign bases. The U.S. Administration's intention to cut its bases on Turkish territory has triggered lively comment in the local press. The question has been raised of the Eskisehir and Erhac bases, where nuclear-armed bombs are stockpiled. In this regard the former Turkish Air Force commander wrote in the newspaper GUNAYDIN that all this will not result in major changes in NATO and Turkish military doctrines. Another Turkish general stated that the Turkish bases scheduled to be cut are secondary, and expressed the confidence that the cuts will not affect the military bases at Badykesir [name as transliterated] and Murted.

The United States intends to close three airbases in South Korea by July 1992. That sounds hopeful, but is it true? Once again, it is true but... The USAF subunits deployed there will be redeployed at airbases at Osan and Kunsan, where the main forces of the Seventh U.S. Air Army are deployed. Eighteen reconnaissance aircraft will be transferred from Tetu [name as transliterated] to

the U.S. base on the Japanese island of Okinawa. We would note in passing that the Japanese Government plans to examine the question of increasing its spending on the upkeep of U.S. bases located on Japanese islands. Incidentally, the United States intends to replace the carrier Midway at Yokosuka with the Independence, which is a more powerful ship. It has not only more modern armaments but an extra 1,000 men in its crew.

The Soviet Union once proposed eliminating its military presence in the Vietnamese port of Cam Ranh if the United States abandoned the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. We did not expect a similar step from Washington. A dead end? No. The USSR had again showed its goodwill. At the end of last year MiG-23 and Tu-16 aircraft were withdrawn from Cam Ranh. That now leaves an air detachment with a variable composition (between six and 10 aircraft). It is quite obvious that such actions are helping to ease military-political tension in the Asia-Pacific region. It would be very desirable if the other side—the United States—responded to the Soviet Union's concrete steps with something appropriate. In general, flexibility and the ability to listen to an opponent's reasons are by no means the least important qualities in politics. Particularly if they help to achieve a strategic goal.

In my view, it is this approach that has been shown by our country in agreeing with the United States not to deploy more than 195,000 ground and air force personnel each on foreign territory in Europe's central zone. For its part, the United States has agreed not to deploy more than 30,000 servicemen outside this zone. Yes, the "symmetry" which people in the West love to campaign for has not been observed. We are cutting more troops than the United States. I fully concede that this has been seen as another Soviet concession. It seems, however, that this is one time when purely numerical evaluations should stay in the background, since the existing accord removes one of the major obstacles to concluding a treaty on conventional forces in Europe this year.

The popular formula that politics is the art of the possible has been reaffirmed yet again. I would merely like to note that in this case the concept of the "possible" is very specific, and it is good when all the participants in the dialogue realize that.

Soviet-U.S. Tax Agreement Talks To Be Held

PM0603132190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "Soviet Union and United States"]

[Text] The Soviet Union and the United States have decided to hold talks to elaborate a new bilateral agreement on taxation issues. The official announcement says that the aim of the talks is to help create favorable conditions for the further development of mutually adantageous relations between our countries in the field of trade and economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation.

Information Exchanges With U.S. To Increase

LD0603120190 Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Washington March 6 TASS—In order to promote superpower relations and strengthen international peace, the Soviet Union has proposed declaring the nineties "a decade of convergence and greater understanding between the Soviet and U.S. people", according to participants in a Soviet-American meeting on information exchanges in Washington.

"We regard information and cultural exchanges as part of a new outlook on the world and on Soviet-American relations," Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, who led the Soviet delegation at the talks, told TASS.

"Superpower summits and a general improvement in Soviet-American relations promote cultural, scientific, and human exchanges. The General Agreement on Cultural and Scientific Exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States, signed in November 1985, turned out to be very fruitful," he said.

"A new programme of cultural and scientific exchanges for 1989-1991, signed during the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow, provided good groundwork for expanding bilateral cooperation," Petrovskiy said.

"We discussed ways of stepping up cultural exchanges, including holding theatre and musical festivals and culture festivals involving soviet republics, more film exchanges and holding annual national film festivals."

"We welcome more library and museum exchanges. We also discussed setting up a joint Soviet-American university, and holding a year of English language and culture in the Soviet Union and of Russian—in the United States."

The idea won support from the Washington-based American Council of Teachers of Russian Language and Education (ACTR) and the American Council on Cooperation in Education and Language Studies.

"Since 1985, contacts between the United States and the Soviet Union have expanded in many spheres," ACTR general director Davidson told TASS.

The superpower dialogue is now transcending intergovernmental agreements, and there is a growing need to help individuals and public groups contact each other.

This will be the major challenge for activists in Soviet-American cultural cooperation in the upcoming years, Davidson said.

Understanding and cooperation between the Soviet and U.S. people in the next few years will, to a large extent,

depend on the ability of the two countries to ensure effective communication in all spheres and at all levels.

China

Upcoming PRC Local Elections Viewed

PM2302163590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "China: Choice and Elections"]

[Text] Beijing—China is preparing for elections to local assemblies of people's representatives. In some areas, elections of deputies at county [uyezd] and district [volost] level have already begun. In other areas, the elections will be held around the middle of the year—as a rule. Only in Beijing has it been decided to postpone the elections until the fourth quarter of the year. After all, the Asian Games begin in the capital in September, and before this a census will be taken. Both these events will require concentrated efforts from many people. But, one way or another, all the organs of state power elected in 1987 will have to be replaced.

Since the country embarked on the reform era and the open-door policy 11 years ago—an era which superseded years of seclusion, isolation, and excessive administration—there have already been four direct elections at county and district level. They are also important because the deputies directly elected by voters will later elect other deputies to city and provincial assemblies. Direct elections end at this stage. Incidentally, provincial and city administrative organs (governors, mayors, and other leaders) are elected at sessions of the corresponding assemblies of people's representatives.

The multiple candidate principle was applied here for the first time the year before last. That, for instance, was how the vice governors of all provinces and even some governors were elected. Despite the fact that in a number of cases provincial party committees recommended out of habit their own candidates for administrative posts, other candidates for the first time—albeit timidly—started to be nominated by the deputies themselves. The multiple candidate principle was then highly assessed by the Chinese press—the people's representatives choose officials and reject those "ratified from on high." The process is difficult.

The youth newspaper ZHONGGUO QINGNIAN BAO discussed the following case. In the town of Wuwei (Gansu Province), an article signed by several deputies appeared in the local newspaper criticizing the work of the municipal government. What did the mayor do? He ordered the newspaper to be withdrawn. ZHONGGUO QINGNIAN BAO wrote: "This act of tyranny would not have happened if the mayor had been elected by deputies." But the multiple candidate system is not a panacea, the commentator thought at the time, the system of electing officials needs to be improved. The following case also occurred: A candidate who had lost in the election calmly obtained a post in a place where elections were not required....

The following opinions are also sometimes expressed: "Democracy should be introduced gradually." In the opinion of one theoretician, immediate direct democracy is impossible for such a big country—"We cannot leap from a system where there has been virtually no choice into a system where everything is decided with the participation of the masses."

So under what conditions will the current local elections be held?

The CPC Central Committee recently issued a circular demanding that local party committees step up their leadership and ensure the success of this important event in the country's political life. The success of the elections, the party document stresses, is vitally necessary to carry out the decisions of the CPC Central Committee plenums of June and November last year. The former, as is well known, was held in connection with the dramatic events of spring and summer in Beijing after which there were major cadre changes. Above all, Zhao Ziyang, the former general secretary, was removed from all leading party posts and a new party leadership headed by Jiang Zemin was elected. The November plenum outlined a strategy for improving and stabilizing the economy. Both plenums clearly voiced the line of unity and stability in society and of stepping up the party's leading role.

Let us note that disseminated along with the Central Committee circular was a document from the National People's Congress Standing Committee Party Group explaining certain issues connected with the elections to county and district assemblies. Thus, for instance, it prescribed that the number of candidate deputies should exceed the number of seats; the electoral commission or an assembly of people's representatives presidium session should be given prior information on candidates; the procedure for registering voters should be simplified; and there should be no stringent restrictions on representation by various sectors of the population. The elections should be led not just by assemblies of people's representatives but by party committees at all levels—that is probably the key idea.

The other day, yet another CPC Central Committee document was published. It concerns the strengthening and improvement of party leadership of the trade unions, the All-China Youth Federation, and the Women's Federation. This document obliges party committees to strive to ensure that these organizations show solidarity with the CPC Central Committee in their policies, thinking, and actions. The party recommends candidates for the main posts in these organizations, and teaches them to subordinate personal interests to state interests, local interests to general interests, and short-term interests to long-term interests. In no event, the document states, should we allow any organization to

conduct political propaganda against the party. An organization which opposes the socialist path of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong thought or undermines state power should be banned by law.

Qiao Shi, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee, recently called in the journal DANG JIAN for a strengthening of centralism and unity and an improvement in the party's style of work. He warned that opposition to party policy should not be tolerated. Commissions to monitor discipline at all levels will step up their monitoring of Communists and leading officials and demand the firm implementation of party policy.

The movement to step up the party's role is taking place against a backdrop of intermittent criticism of former General Secretary Zhao Ziyang. One writer, for instance, considers that his proposal for party organizers at enterprises to restrict their activity to purely party spheres, leaving key production decisions to managers was a mistake. I would note, incidentally, that the idea of demarcating party and administrative functions, which was actively voiced at the 13th Party Congress in fall 1987 and was a key component in the reform of the political system, has now somehow started to wither away.

When Yu Zhongwen, a lecturer at Shenzhen University and deputy secretary of the party committee, was telling me recently about the administrative structure at this higher educational establishment which is located in a Special Economic Zone open to foreign investment he formulated a new model very clearly: Initially there was a system of rector responsibility, now there is a different model—rector responsibility under the leadership of the party committee. In short, the centralization which emerged during the years of the revolutionary and national liberation struggle and when the party to all intents and purposes assumed the role of the government—which was dictated by the revolutionary situation in China at the time—has clearly not been eradicated. At least at primary organization level.

But let us return to the CPC Central Committee circular, which was discussed at the start of this article and which is devoted to the forthcoming elections to local organs of power. Here is how it foresees the expected difficulties in the election campaign. There will be physical difficulties—migration of the urban population is increasing. A population moving from place to place creates numerous problems. Sociologists associate this with the growth in crime. Difficulties also arise for those organizing elections in the countryside: Migration to the cities continues, so where will voters be found?

There are psychological difficulties. The authors of the analysis stated briefly and without giving details that certain cadre workers are simply tired of elections. This sounds significant. Then there are ideological difficulties: The party circular, for instance, predicts negative consequences from the spread in society of "erroneous democratic concepts" and the tendency toward "bourgeois liberalization" which has become widespread in recent years.

The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO recently wrote: "Yes, China's political structure is incomplete, and this is historically justified. And the restructuring of it begun under the Communist Party's leadership," the newspaper insists, "is nothing but the self-improvement of the People's Republic." How can we talk about the need for fundamental reform of the so-called "despotic monarchy," it asks. In this case the CPC Central Committee organ takes issue with Yan Jiaqi, the well-known political scientist and one of the founders in Paris of the "front for Chinese democracy," whose activity is banned in the country. The newspapers believe that calling China a "despotic monarchy" (Yan Jiaqi's expression) is tantamount to calling for a new revolution in the country. In the newspaper's view these statements became the theoretical foundation for last year's antigovernment social unrest. RENMIN RIBAO also believes that Yan Jiaqi advocates copying the U.S. bourgeois political system with its division of power (the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary), its pluralist policy, and its constitutional guarantees for private property and the concept of federalism.

Probably the most acute criticism of "bourgeois liberalization" was after the spring and summer events in Beijing. The main indicator of this trend was also formulated: extreme individualism—the "individual above all." The Chinese press is also pointing out typical features of "bourgeois liberalization": monetary fetishism, bourgeois democracy, opposition to public ownership (private ownership being salvation), propaganda of ethnic nihilism, the rejection of traditional culture, a new view of imperialist aggression ("it would have been better for China to have been a colony for 300 years"), non-class-based [nadklassovyy] humanism (including a demand to free political prisoners), and political pluralism (including a rejection of the Communist Party's leadership and the need for an opposition). Added to this is the rejection of "obsolete Marxism" (the principles are right, the conclusions are wrong) and of the democratic dictatorship of the people (it is nothing but "tyrannical power"), and all-embracing criticism of Mao's ideas.

As if to counter this (last) view the Military Academy Publishing House recently published a book entitled "Mao Zedong: The Art of Leadership," which tells of how Mao achieved a high level of perfection in the art of organizational and political work.

Different times bring different priorities. I recall that just 18 months ago representatives of intellectual circles in an interview with the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO—pondering on the strategic mistakes of previous decades, obsolete values, attempts to force the pace of the "advent of communism," and the many other things that China had rejected since its good start 50 years ago—said that Mao Zedong had never visited the developed countries

of the West and therefore his assessments were inevitably tinged with a lack of understanding of the nature of modern capitalism. They said that the thinking of many people, particularly officials, had been formed in the context of the class struggle. And that a new era needs new ideas too....

How hard it is sometimes to know where to draw the line! For example, at what point does the natural desire to improve one's lot, overcome the monotony of a drab life, and acquire a taste for fashion turn into money-grubbing and the pursuit of a fast buck? Or how can the people with a yen for exploration and experiment engendered by the reform era be made compatible with those who "learn from Lei Feng"—the young lad who died doing his military service in 1962 and who had dreamed of "always being a soldier, Chairman Mao's rustproof rifle"? The selflessness and moral purity of the "Lei Fengs" is beyond doubt, but are the ideas they follow all that attractive? Will they find followers in China today? These days unthinking obedience is hardly a virtue. People in China say: "Do not climb mountains—you will not learn how high heaven is."

Delegation Discusses Trade on PRC Visit

LD0703120990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Video report from Beijing by correspondent Kulikov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A Soviet Government delegation led by Katushev, our country's minister of foreign economic relations, has arrived in Beijing.

[Kulikov] The economic and trade relations between our countries, which have been given a powerful impetus since the May summit meeting in Beijing, are improving. [video shows meeting with unidentified PRC, Soviet officials] This is confirmed by the current visit by a Soviet Government delegation. Incidentally, it is the first trip to China in three decades by a Soviet Ministry official in charge of foreign trade matters. In the course of the talks, which have begun in Beijing and are attended on the Chinese side by Zheng Tuobin, China's minister of foreign economic relations and trade, a protocol for the current year is to be signed.

Today too, at the Zhongnanhai party and government residence, the Soviet delegation was received by Comrade Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council. [video shows Li Peng shaking hands with Katushev]. Matters pertaining to the further expansion and deepening of cooperation between our countries were discussed. The tendency of that cooperation is towards the growth of trade turnover, the extension of the assortment of goods, the appearance of new forms of trade and economic ties between the USSR and the PRC, and the involvement in it of more and more partners, both in our country and in China.

[Announcer] The Soviet delegation will spend seven days in China. Apart from Beijing, it will visit the towns of Tianjin, Shanghai, and (Semeng).

Northeast Asia

Mongolian Party Plenum Continues 13 Mar

LD1303024190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0154 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 13 March, (TASS)—The Eighth Plenum of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee continues its work here today. It is discussing the political situation which has arisen in the country, an analysis of which was given by Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the party Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Hural, who made a report

The plenum is also discussing questions connected with the convocation on 10 April of the extraordinary congress of the MPRP and a proposal concerning ammending articles of the Mongolian People's Republic's [MPR's] Constitution and the party's leading role.

The organizational question being examined at the plenum incorporates three points: the proposal on the resignation of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Central Committee as a whole, on renewing the composition of the Central Committee, and also on elections of a new Politburo and Secretariat.

Also on the agenda is the discussion of the proposal on nominations of candidates for the post of the chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Hural and the chairman of the MPR's Council of Ministers for their subsequent nomination at the session of the Great People's Hural.

Correspondent Reports

LD1203190190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Report from Ulaanbaatar by correspondent Lordkipanidze; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Mongolia. The Eighth Plenum of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] began work in Ulaanbaatar today. Our own correspondent Lordkipanidze reports from Ulaanbaatar.

[Lordkipanidze] The plenum was not called an emergency, however it was convened in connection with emergency events. [passage omitted]

[Lordkipanidze] In his report to the plenum, Jambyn Batmonh said, in part:

The plenum should submit a proposal to the Great People's Hural on changes to the country's constitution. The MPRP renounces the monopoly on power. The

party will cooperte with all forces for a law-governed state, for the purposes of building a humane democratic socialism in the name of the fundamental interests of the people.

[Announcer] One addition to this reportage. Speaking at the plenum, Jambyn Batmonh reported that members and candidate members of the Politburo and secretaries of the party's Central Committee have decided to resign en masse. Batmonh also proposed that an emergency party congress be convened for 10 april of this year. [video shows demonstrations, hunger strikers, Batmonh speaking at rostrum, and views of the plenum]

IZVESTIYA on Democratic Union's Objectives

PM0703160990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Nabatchikov: "Mongolia: Rally Atmosphere"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—Despite repeated statements regarding its desire for extensive dialogue with the party to resolve the tasks of accelerating restructuring, the Mongolian Democratic Union [MDU] appears to be increasingly given to activity involving the issuing of ultimatums. And it cannot be ruled out that it is trying to consolidate the different streams of the new social formations and movements in the country on precisely that basis.

Instead of seeking ways for constructive collaboration and dialogue with all sides interested in renewing society, on which, incidentally, the MDU leaders initially insisted, they are actually pinning their hopes on the emotional atmosphere generated by rallies. Here the incontestable fact that the party has already begun and is stepping up the process of cleansing and renewing itself is essentially dismissed or completely ignored.

The latest mass rally, held on Sunday, united four main social movements—the MDU, the Social Democratic Movement, the New Progressive Union, and the Mongolian Student Union.

However, one question will not go away: On what basis exactly has this taken place? Representatives of those organizations present at the rally with whom I spoke claimed that it is based on the platform of the democratic revolution that has started up in the country.

However, I cannot get rid of the feeling that the rally on this occasion marked not just a new stage in consolidating and augmenting the ranks of the various currents of informals, which was indicated by the unprecedented number of participants—over 20,000. Something else was noteworthy, this latest challenge to the government and the party was backed up by a mass demonstration at Government House with the handing over of a joint statement to the Great People's Hural Presidium, the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee, and J. Batmonh personally, by representatives of the four independent movements in the presence of an enormous mass of demonstrators. The statement calls, in the most categorical fashion, for the convening before this month is out of an extraordinary plenum of the MPRP Central Committee, the renewal of the composition of the leading party body, the setting up of a provisional people's hural on the basis of the equal representation within it of all the political forces of society, and also the approval of a new constitution and the holding of democratic nationwide elections.

The biased approaches to certain questions of Mongolian-Soviet relations, which have never before been endorsed in such a blatant and aggressive way, are striking. Fueling passions on these painful issues, a number of speakers whipped up the excited public with skillfully sifted facts and figures in a bid to prove that Soviet aid to Mongolia is virtually a means of its enslavement and even constitutes interference in the sovereign state's internal affairs. And finally even the just-signed agreement to completely withdraw Soviet troops from Mongolian territory was subject to doubt and reproaches, particularly for unduly dragging out the timetable for withdrawal and failing to take the real situation into account.

On the whole the ultimatum petition handed to the Mongolian leadership and the speeches at the latest informal rally essentially constitute an act of single-minded opposition to the party's efforts to solve painful problems.

When noble objectives and ideas begin to be expressed from a public rostrum mixed up with peremptory, rash conclusions and judgments one automatically wonders whether a genuine basis for uniting all the informal units exists. Is not all this just an attempt to mobilize social forces on the MDU platform in order to dictate terms to the leadership and ultimately blame it for all the country's real and imaginary sins and misfortunes and remove it from the political arena?

The closed ranks of the informals will receive an answer to their joint statement very soon. But it is unclear as yet what response they themselves will be able to give to the challenge of the times by issuing a challenge to the government and the MPRP Central Committee Politburo.

Article Views Democratic Union Congress

PM0903131090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 9, 27 Feb-5 Mar 90 pp 16-17

[Aleksandr Didusenko dispatch: "From 'Socialism' to Socialism. A Democratic Revolution in a Land That Has Leaped Out of Feudalism"]

[Text] Ulan Bator—Eastern Europe's changes no longer amaze. Indeed, what could after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the deletion of the term "socialism" from the

official titles of some countries and the return of crosses and crowns in national coats-of-arms. What now amazes are the changes to be observed in Central Asia.

When I arrived in Ulan Bator a year ago, I still felt I was in the capital of a land which, as many official documents emphasized, had successfully leaped from feudalism to socialism, skipping capitalism. It was said to have built up a powerful industry and a prosperous cooperative agriculture and ensured a systematically rising standard of popular welfare. However, today, as I was officially told by the press department of the Foreign Ministry, Mongolia is a country that calls itself a developing state and seeks international recognition of this status. In Ulan Bator one year ago no one questioned the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party's right to its guiding role in the state. It was maintained that it enjoyed the absolute trust and support of the masses and that it was successfully restructuring the socio-economic and political system. Now I saw that the MPRP was frankly censured by literally everyone for the inadequately high rate of advance and an inconsistent restructuring effort. Among the host of unofficial associations and organizations that have been set up, some not only question the MPRP's right to a guiding role and call for a multiparty political system, but even take realistic steps thereto.

On Sunday, February 18, a day that the Buddhist calendar believes particularly favourable, the Mongolian Democratic Union (MDU) held its first convention at which, apart from other things, the creation of the Mongolian Democratic Party (MDP) was announced. Notifying the press of this development, G. Boshigt, a spokesman for the new party's leadership, said that to date it had a membership of 200 and that its emergence in the political arena stemmed from that deep-seated socio-economic, political and spiritual crisis which had struck Mongolian society. He said that it did not plan to become a mass party, and that admission to membership would be highly individualized. However, he added, it hoped its political platform would win popular credibility and that it would offer a realistic alternative to the MPRP.

Thus, for several days now Mongolia has had an officially recognized alternative party with its own alternative programme and rules, which so far only its founder members know. Consequently, thus far one cannot view the MDP as a realistic political force. Commanding much greater significance and clout is the MDU, a broad public movement integrating numerous informal societies, associations and organizations, including the MDP.

Established slightly over two months ago on the initiative of a small group of intellectuals and factory workers, the MDU now has a membership of up to 70,000, mostly of the younger generation. Note that seven in every ten delegates to the MDU's first convention were members of Mongolia's Revolutionary Young Communist League, three of every twenty were Communist Party members, while nine in every ten were trade union members. The convention's 701 delegates represented 101 chapters in four cities and in 16 of the country's 18 aimaks. For a republic with a population of but two million, a socio-political movement of 70,000 comprises a serious factor.

Though this involuntarily suggests comparisons with the movements in the East European countries, such as Solidarnosc and the Civic Forum, MDU does not plan to oust communists from public affairs and does not think Mongolia's revolution a historical blunder. On the contrary, it maintains the ideals that Mongolia's revolutionists under Sukhe Bator initially sought after the victory of the revolution were subsequently distorted and, hence, should be re-invigorated. As was emphasized at the convention, the physical annihilation in the late 1930s of Sukhe Bator's comrades, genuine revolutionists, caused the MPRP to relinquish its revolutionary character and degenerate into an implement of the administrative-bureaucratic system. The power of the people was supplanted by the power of a group who led the country into an impasse.

"In the upshot, we strayed from the highroad of civilization," Hatan Baatar, an activist of the MDU movement For Democratic Socialism, observed in that connection.

The MDU convention adopted a programme defining Mongolia's restructuring as a revolutionary process capable of attaining a sensible solution of acute vital social issues. The MDU, this document declares, "stigmatizes Stalinism and Brezhnevism and its Mongolian variant, Tsedenbalism." In its activity, MDU will consistently seek to extricate the country from the deep crisis, ameliorate every aspect of public life and promote political pluralism and national culture and traditions.

"Though we do not question the MPRP's legitimacy in Mongolian society," S. Zorig, the MDU's coordinator-general noted, "we hope all communists, as comprising a tangible factor in our political life, will vigorously contribute to the effort to ensure a healthier social political climate and that the MPRP will deem it possible to have the country normally develop within the context of a multiparty system as ensuring democracy."

In its appeal to the people of Mongolia, the MDU convention—which, incidentally, was fully televised, also an indication of the MDU's clout—stresses that it "represents the beginning of a new era in the development of the Mongolian nation, the beginning of a democratic revoluton and has demonstrated the cohesion of the patriotic forces, whose ideals are democracy, humanism, pluralism, justice and the irreversibility for the country of the worldwide process of revolutionary restructuring."

The MDU urges scrapping the administrative-bureaucratic political system to enable every Mongolian to enjoy the fruits of his labour and be the master in his own land, guarantee every citizen all conditions for a happy family life, and show genuine concern for the

elderly, the mothers of large families, orphans, and the families of the innocently repressed.

Significantly, many of the points in this appeal, especially as concerns the promotion of democracy, openness and criticism of past blunders, directly interweave with the theses of the letter that the Political Bureau of the MPRP Central Committee issued to commnists a fortnight earlier. Many here believe that this paves the way for an early dialogue between the MDU and the MPRP in the effort to produce a public consensus.

However, the MDU convention's address to the Presidium of the People's Great Hural and the MPRP Central Committee, demanding that parliament be dissolved, an early election be held, and the Central Committee and government resign, has introduced a different slant to the overall political atmosphere.

Thus far the MPRP has not responded, while the trade union newspaper Hodolmor says that this demand is voiced only by the MDU, not by the entire nation.

No MDU leader attending the news conference for Mongolian and foreign newsmen directly said what would eventualize were the MPRP not to agree to the ultimatum.

Mongolian Strikers Reject Government Appeal

PM1203132190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Nabatchikov dispatch: "Reply Made, Questions Remain"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—As already reported (see IZVESTIYA No. 66), the MDU [Mongolian Democratic Union] together with three other new public organizations adopted a joint statement at a rally last Sunday and sent it to the country's party and government leadership.

It contained, in particular, a demand for an extraordinary party congress to be convened as early as this month, for the party's Central Committee to be renewed, and for a provisional people's hural to be formed to shape a new organ of state power by democratic means and to adopt a new constitution. In addition, the statement laid down, virtually as an ultimatum, the condition that an exhaustive reply be made to all these demands no later than 7 March.

The official reply to that statement—disseminated on Mongolian radio and television and in the central press—points out that the question of convening an extraordinary party congress is to be resolved within the framework of the norms of the party statutes and will be examined at the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee Plenum 12 March.

It goes on to state that the dissolution of the People's Great Hural, as demanded by the MDU, can be decided only by the people as a whole and by the supreme organ of state power, i.e. by the People's Great Hural session scheduled for 21 March. Under conditions of the continuing mandate of the present People's Great Hural the creation of a provisional people's hural with the right to approve a new constitution would mean a serious violation of the current MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] Constitution.

At the same time the country's leadership reaffirmed its readiness to cooperate with the informal movement to accelerate the progress of restructuring on the basis of a constructive dialogue and mutual understanding. This is the stand of the MPRP Central Committee Politburo and the MPR People's Great Hural Presidium, which made this statement.

However, the MDU leaders considered their reply unconstructive and unsatisfactory. Their protest action followed without delay, taking the form—unprecedented in the country—of a mass hunger strike. It began in the Mongolian capital's main square, where a temporary ban on the holding of unsanctioned mass meetings had recently been imposed on the special orders of the city authorities.

Interrupting a festive concert late Wednesday evening, Mongolian television broadcast a government appeal to the participants in the unusual action in Suhbaatar Square to end the hunger strike, as such an extreme measure could be injurious to their health and have a negative impact on public opinion.

The appeal points out that the questions raised by the informal associations and unions concern the basic principles of the organization of the political system in the country, and an extremely attentive and earnest approach is needed in resolving them in the interests of the country's present and future, while excessive running ahead and the artificial acceleration of events could do even greater harm than a delay.

City Mayor S. Munhjargal visited the hunger strikers Thursday morning, suggesting that he act as an intermediary between them and the country's government and expressing his readiness to give them humane assistance. The reaction was categorical—"without the resignation of the ruling party's Central Committee Politburo we will not end our hunger strike..."

Meanwhile, confirming its desire to seek compromises, the country's leadership held the first round of a direct political dialogue with the leaders of informal movements and organizations. There was a live relay of it on Mongolian radio and television.

During the two-hour discussion the MPRP representatives reminded the informals that the questions raised by them of the cardinal renewal of the party apparatus and the People's Great Hural concern the basic organizational principles of the political system and, in the final analysis, the fate of the whole country and the whole people.

This not only requires the utmost attention and an earnest approach to them on the basis of respect for the existing laws but also relates exclusively to the competence of these organs themselves. Therefore such questions cannot be decided under pressure from any one side. A hunger strike declared under such conditions is an attempt to impose one's demands by force and runs counter to the principles of humanism and to society's interests.

For the purpose of consolidating efforts to accelerate restructuring the "roundtable", participants speaking for the MPRP and the government proposed setting up without delay a joint commission to draw up a new constitution, a law on elections, and a law on political parties. Their opponents, however, insisted on resolving these and other questions by convening a provisional people's hural and not within the framework of a special commission in order, so they declared, to ensure a normal transition from "a system of dictatorship to a democratic system."

On behalf of the group of activists of informal movements on hunger strike E. Batuul [name as transliterated], member of the MDU Main Coordinating Council, read to the participants in the dialogue a statement addressed to the MPRP Central Committee Politburo members, accusing them of political incompetence and irresponsibility. Demanding the Politburo's resignation, the hunger strikers declared that they are ready to "place their lives in one pan of the scales whose other pan holds the Politburo."

Despite the fact that all the participants in the first round of the dialogue went away giving an assurance that they would continue it once more, the informals, and the Mongolian Students Union above all, provoked a new wave of public disturbances which swamped the capital's central square early Friday morning.

ROK Minister To Visit CSSR, Bulgaria

SK0703143690 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 6 Mar 90

[From the "Asian News" program under the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Choe Ho-chung, the minister of Foreign Affairs for the Republic of Korea, is to visit Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria during March to discuss establishing diplomatic relations with those two countries.

The Republic's Foreign Ministry spokesman in Seoul stated that the ROK also plans to sign agreements with Bulgaria on trade, scientific, and technological cooperation.

Last year, the ROK established diplomatic relations with Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia. Talks are under way with the GDR and Romania for the same purpose.

It was noted in the statement released by the spokesman for the Republic's Foreign Ministry that Choe Ho-chung will also visit Yugoslavia, India, and Pakistan. During his visits to these countries Choe Ho-chung will sound out the possibilities for cooperation between the ROK and the Nonaligned Movement.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnam's Nguyen Van Linh on Renewal Process

PM0203121790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conference in Ho Chi Minh City"]

[Text] Hanoi, 28 Feb—Deep and comprehensive renewal in the economic and political spheres is the strategic course of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV]. This was stated by Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, at a republic conference in Ho Chi Minh City on questions of ideology and the activity of local press organs.

The initial successes achieved last year, the Vietnamese leader noted, demonstrate the need to continue the cause of renewal using methods appropriate to our country's actual conditions. It should also be stressed that these achievements are still very precarious. The lack of guarantees of social justice cause special concern to working people.

Speaking about the tasks which are to be resolved this year, the general secretary of the CPV Central Committee pointed out that ideological work must promote the cause of renewal, the broadening of democracy, and the increased effectiveness of the party and state apparatus' activity. A considerable section of cadre workers and Communists, he said, have made flagrant errors, lost contact with the working masses, and taken the path of opportunism. To restore and strengthen the people's faith in the party it is necessary to resolutely cleanse party ranks of corrupt elements. Each cadre worker and party member, whatever his post, must live and work in accordance with the law.

Soviet-SRV Intergovernmental Commission Meets

LD0603201290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1016 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Ho Chi Minh city, 6 Mar (TASS)—The 15th session of the Soviet-Vietnamese intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation has been held here. It summed up the results of the two countries' cooperation over the last year and examined matters of further improving it, taking into account the reforms of the mechanism for running the national economy, which are being carried out in the USSR and the SRV. The delegations were headed by the cochairmen of the commission: for the Soviet side, V. K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and for the Vietnamese side, Nguyen Co Thach, member of the Communist Party of

Vietnam [CPV] Central Commitee Politburo and deputy chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers.

Attention was given, in the main, to further improving the ways and forms and increasing the efficiency of cooperation and to achieving more balance in trade. It was noted that the main task is to concentrate efforts on implementing accords reached between the Soviet Union and Vietnam on deepening economic links and obtaining real returns for investments. It was stressed at the same time that in the new conditions of economic management that are coming into being in both countries, restructuring the entire mechanism of cooperation is vitally needed as is its intensive transfer to the path of developing production cooperatives, creating joint enterprises, and strengthening direct production, scientific, and technical links between enterprises, organizations, and individual regions in the two countries.

Scientific and technical cooperation were discussed and specific ways mapped out which are aimed at raising its efficiency and at moving as close as possible toward solving economic and social tasks.

The intergovernmental commission paid particular attention to precise coordination of the national economic plans of the two countries for 1991-1995, as well as to working out a draft concept for Soviet-Vietnamese economic, scientific, and technical cooperation for the period up to the year 2005.

A protocol was signed on the results of the sitting which took place in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

V.K. Gusev, head of the Soviet delegation, was received by Do Muoi, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers. A friendly conversation took place between them.

The delegation visited a number of Vietnam's enterprises and associations, including those taking part in a program of cooperation with the USSR.

Nguyen Van Linh Receives Gusev

LD0703101190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0924 GMT 7 Mar 90

[Text] Ho Chi Minh, 7 Mar (TASS)—Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee, has received V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who headed the Soviet delegation which was here to participate in the sitting of the permanent intergovernmental Soviet-Vietnamese Commission on Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

At the meeting, which was conducted in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, the head of the Soviet delegation briefed the Vietnamese leader on the current targets of the process of perestroyka in the USSR and on the progress of preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

Nguyen Van Linh wished the Soviet people success in the work of implementing economic and political reforms. Successful surmounting of the difficulties facing the Soviet people, he underlined, will give fresh forces to the development of socialism, in the interests of strengthening peace, independence, and democracy on the planet. The general secretary of the CPV Central Committee conveyed gratitude to the leadership of the USSR and to the Soviet people for their selfless aid to Vietnam in construction of socialism and defense of socialist gains. He confirmed the CPV'S course of friendship and all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union.

CPSU Auditing Officials Visit SRV, Cambodia

PM0203122390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of officials from CPSU control and auditing bodies headed by A.A. Nizovtseva, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, visited Vietnam and Cambodia 20 through 28 February in accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] and the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party [KPRP].

The delegation was received in Vietnam by Tran Kien, secretary of the CPV Central Committee and chairman of the CPV Central Committee Party Control Committee, and in Cambodia by Sim Ka, candidate member of the KPRP Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the KPRP Central Committee Party Control Committee.

CPV Politburo Member Discusses SRV Economy

90UI0343A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Dao Duy Tung, Politburo member, secretary of the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party: "Like a Fresh Breeze"; first three paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] **February 3d marks 60 years since the formation of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV].**

Over the course of all six decades, the CPV has stood at the forefront of the people's struggle for freedom and independence, against colonial domination. It has been the organizer of wars of resistance to French, and then American intervention.

The 6th CPV Congress charted a revolutionary course towards renewal of all aspects of life, including the sphere of party construction. The party elevated communists and the entire people to a socio-economic restructuring of society. This article deals with how the renewal process is proceeding in its major aspect, the economic sphere.

The 6th CPV Congress, convened in December 1986, promoted a course leading to renewal. Its ideas enlivened society like a fresh breeze. Caught up in the enthusiasm, many believed the socio-economic situation of the country would soon change for the better. Things turned out differently, however.

The economic situation continued to worsen after the congress. In particular, the food shortage intensified at the beginning of 1988. There was an escalation in prices and a three-fold increase in the rate of inflation. A deep skepticism emerged among the popular masses; confidence in the leadership dropped. Naturally the question arose—why, when the socio-economic situation was undergoing renewal, not only were things slow to change, but were they actually worsening in a number of sectors?

The country's leadership did not lose its composure; it analyzed the situation and concluded that renewal is not a smooth path, but rather a difficult revolutionary struggle. It is impossible to overcome so many problems caused by a variety of factors in just one day. To uncover mistakes and set aside what is obsolete is not easy. But to find something new to replace the old is a far more difficult task. It is important to chart a course for renewal, but time is necessary to put it into practical use. It must be embodied in specific measures and safeguarded by the law.

A year and a half is not a long time for implementing what has been planned to the extent that the course of change is noticeable. But even today we are able to say that, as a result of the new policies being implemented, some bright areas have appeared against the overall background of the socio-economic situation in the country.

Beginning in 1988 and continuing up to the present time, events have developed basically in accordance with this analysis. The renewal has already achieved its first important successes in many spheres—the economy, ideology, democracy, defense, and foreign policy.

I will first say a few words about agriculture, which occupies an extremely important position in Vietnam. Today 76 percent of the population lives in rural areas.

In spite of the fact that Vietnam is an agrarian country, the state has been required over decades, nonetheless, to expend great effort in order to produce a minimal amount of food and produce for workers and employees. The purchase of grain, meat, fish, vegetables, and fruits from the peasants at state-established prices has always met with difficulty, and the food situation remains aggravated.

In 1989 the food and produce situation began to change. Requirements of the population began to be satisfied and the state established a reliable food supply. Last year we succeeded in exporting about a million tons of rice to pay off our existing debt and we imported necessary agricultural resources. We did away with rationing of meat, fish, and vegetables.

Why did the situation change so quickly? For the first time in history, food production in 1989 exceeded the 20 million ton level—this is a million tons greater than the previous year's yield. Favorable weather conditions and effective introduction of the achievements of scientific-technological progress play a role, of course, in this success. But the main factor consists of unswerving adherence to the policy of renewal in the agricultural sphere.

First of all, the state changed the system of purchasing from the peasants—it did away with compulsory procurement and state-established prices, and shifted to contractual prices. We have allowed free trade in produce, eliminating all obstacles in this regard.

A new system of wages was introduced for the cities. Today workers and employees have the opportunity to spend their wages not only in state and cooperative stores, where they formerly obtained goods using ration cards, but on the free market as well. Thus, state trade has begun to lose customers and accumulate a surplus. As a result, we have had to close a number of stores selling rice, meat, and vegetables. It turns out that, under renewal, state trade does not have the necessary ability to sell goods to the population.

No less significant is the fact that, having renewed the mechanism for agricultural management, we have accomplished transition to a multi-structured economy. With respect to cooperatives, a contract system has begun to operate actively here. But the situation involving cooperatives is peculiar in that three types of ownership exist simultaneously—national ownership of the land, collective ownership of the means of production, and ownership by members of the cooperative of certain types of means of production.

The new mechanism combines the power of the cooperative with the capabilities of each peasant; otherwise, it's like it used to be—as we say, "In a pagoda of many monks, you have no one to close the door."

We believe the first steps have been taken. The food problem has not yet been completely solved—per capita food production remains low, amounting to 300 kilograms this year. Every year the population of Vietnam grows by more than a million people. The country is constantly subject to natural calamities. The material base for agriculture is low.

The party's new agrarian policies have met with certain difficulties, the greatest of which has been the sale of agricultural production. Lowered prices for several production varieties provide no incentive for the peasants to increase production. Inefficient management of a number of cooperatives has led to formal—or "white" as we say—family contracting. Having formed a lease, the governing body considers its work accomplished and thus allows things to drift. But the family contract does not function outside the cooperative; it operates within

its framework. Today this has led to 10-15 percent of peasants' farms being unable to function successfully and receiving low income.

Significant changes have taken place in supplying the population with consumer goods, the market undergoing particular change in 1989. Today it is saturated with goods—from in-country production and products shipped from Vietnamese workers in the socialist countries, as well as from imported, even contraband goods. The state has refused to subsidize prices for consumer goods and has shifted to commercial prices. Prices for most goods have undergone practically no appreciable fluctuation in recent times.

More must be said regarding foreign economic ties. The party and the state attach great significance to expanding such ties. In 1989, exports surpassed programmed levels by approximately 40 percent. We have every reason to believe that the indices determined by the 6th Party Congress in the sphere of exports will be over fulfilled in 1990.

Serious problems exist in the imbalance between Vietnam's solvency and her volume of trade. Each year we are required to borrow for the construction of our material-technical base. We receive a tremendous amount of assistance from the fraternal socialist countries, especially from the USSR.

As far as the non-socialist countries and international financial organizations are concerned, because of the policy of economic blockade being conducted by imperialist and reactionary forces with respect to Vietnam, they are providing an extremely limited amount of aid to our country. Step by step, however, we are trying to eliminate the blockade and broaden ties. The law on foreign investments is a specific expression of Vietnam's new economic policy.

Foreign economic ties must not be restricted within the framework of trade volume and credits. An important direction is seen in the expansion of production cooperation by establishing direct ties with Western partners, self-financing, and joint responsibility for both profits and losses. We also attach significance to such activities as cooperation in the sphere of use of labor resources, tourism, and the servicing of maritime shipping and air transportation. The creation of joint enterprises with foreign partners, including construction of foreign enterprises in Vietnam, is an innovation which conforms to the general trends of world economic development.

To date licenses have been granted here for about 100 investment projects, representing a total value of $800 million.

Proceeding from decisions of the 6th Party Congress and subsequent plenums, we have begun to correct the long-existing arrangement favoring development of heavy industry, and we are exerting efforts to accomplish three economic programs—production of food, consumer goods, and exports.

Evaluating the successes we have achieved according to their merit, we are not allowing ourselves to become enfeebled since the socio-economic situation of the country still remains difficult; the economy is developing slowly, unstably, and with low efficiency. The state budget deficit is great. Our foreign economic debts are growing and credits are not covered in timely fashion.

Many negative phenomena are seen in the scheme of providing public order. Then too, the weak material-technical base is deteriorating. This country, with a population of 65 million people, annually produces just six million tons of coal, 60,000 tons of steel, two million tons of cement, eight billion kilowatt-hours of electric power, and 20 million tons of food. It is apparent that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam has still not emerged from socio- economic crisis.

It is very important in such a situation to see that over three years of renewal, the party and people have gained a clearer perspective of forward movement, have found ways to resolve a number of problems, and have created conditions for bringing the country out of its difficult situation. The party has learned a number of lessons, the most important of which is the fact that key sectors need to be identified to ensure the success of our mission; effort must be concentrated on these and renewal accomplished in integrated and all-encompassing fashion. We must establish ties between economic renewal and political renewal.

We cannot expect full renewal in the economic situation without political restructuring. This must be accomplished in stages but what has ripened must be picked immediately. For example, we must improve the work of the National Assembly, perfect the system of elections to people's soviets at all levels, and perfect the methods and style of party leadership through democratization of intra-party life, cadre selection and placement, respectful treatment regarding the status and functions of state and mass organizations. We must overcome bureaucratism and dictatorship.

In conducting our renewal, we are rousing the popular masses to conduct a struggle against internal and external hostile forces, against opportunistic elements and elements losing their privileges which are striving to take advantage of the difficulties our country faces to further their mercenary aims. This struggle is directed towards providing political stability, without which there can be no renewal.
Hanoi.

Yazov Holds Conversation With SRV Counterpart

PM0203112390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Friendly Conversation"]

[Text] On 28 February Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, met with Army

General Le Duc Anh, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and SRV national defense minister, during a stopover in Moscow.

There was a warm and friendly conversation on matters of mutual interest.

SRV Ambassador to the USSR Nguyen Manh Cam participated in the meeting.

TASS, VNA Communications Link Begins

LD0203143890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0900 GMT 2 Mar 90

[Text] Hanoi, 2 Mar (TASS)—A new multichannel communications system between the Vietnamese News Agency (VNA) and TASS, based on personal computers, was today put into permanent operation. It is hard to evaluate the significance of this event for the VNA, and above all because it will permit the agency to go over to an automated method of processing reports and photographic information received from TASS and also from the agencies of the European socialist countries.

Near East & South Asia

Iranian Official in Damascus To Discuss Hostages

NC0503175490 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] A high-level Iranian official went to Damascus and held talks on releasing the Westerners being held hostage by pro-Iranian Muslim Shiites in Lebanon. Mahmud Hashemi, head of one of the Iranian Foreign Ministry departments, met with Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar'. They discussed coordinating their governments' efforts on releasing the nearly 20 hostages.

Progress of Soviet-Iranian Relations Viewed

NC0303120890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 2 Mar 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Tehran's RESALAT published an interview with Naser Nowbari-Heyrani, Iran's ambassador to the Soviet Union, with the intention of clarifying the state of Soviet-Iranian relations at the current stage. Our commentator writes on this:

I think that the Iranian ambassador's interview gave a genuine picture of the situation and of the achievements of Soviet-Iranian cooperation. Generally speaking, these relations are progressing victoriously and the resumption of Iranian gas exports to the Soviet Union in the near future proves this.

Mr. Nowbari's remarks on Soviet-Iranian military cooperation may have caused concern. (?This was coupled) with an analysis of Iranian-Iraqi relations, for which normalization unfortunately has a long way to go yet. Some may express doubts about whether Soviet-Iranian cooperation meets the interests of regional peace. We think that these doubts are baseless. The Soviet-Iranian communique stated on the principles of equal relations that the Soviet side has agreed to cooperate with the Iranian side to strengthen the latter's defense power. What is so unprecedented and scandalous in this? Does such a cooperation not also exist in Soviet-Iraqi relations and is such cooperation rare in the world? The most important point is that military cooperation in the Soviet Union's relations with Iran and Iraq is minimum and the volume of these relations with these countries leads to the consolidation of peace and stability in the region.

The Soviet factor works contrary to the exacerbation of tensions between the two Persian Gulf neighbors and the proof of this is the agreements voiced in Tehran and Baghdad with the Soviet Union's proposals on a meeting among the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union, Iran, and Iraq in order to find ways to bring the Iran-Iraq conflict out of its impasse.

TEHRAN INTERNATIONAL [as heard] comments on this and points out that the positive reactions by Tehran and Baghdad to the Soviet proposal conforms with the expectations of the Persian Gulf nations for progress in the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 598.

It is difficult to say who is to blame for the halt in the peaceful solution to the Iran-Iraq conflict because the talks on a peaceful solution are taking place in complete secrecy. All the 15 meetings between the Iranian and Iraqi delegations after the cease-fire have been held behind closed doors. (?However), everyone knows that despite the active efforts by the international forums and by the UN secretary general, Resolution 598, which is the basis for a political solution, has not been implemented. The armies of both Iran and Iraq hold on to their positions at the time the cease-fire was declared and they have not withdrawn to international borders. It is especially because of this that helping the UN to activate the peace talks enjoys an important place in Soviet foreign policy.

TASS Reports Cooperation Meeting With Iran

LD0303233690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1358 GMT 3 Mar 90

[Text] Tehran, 3 Mar (TASS)—Today the 12th sitting of the permanent commission on economic cooperation between the USSR and the Islamic Republic of Iran began work here. The Soviet delegation is led by N.S. Konarev, USSR minister of railways, and the Iranian one is led by M. Nurbakhsh, minister of economics and finance of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In his speech at the plenary sitting M. Nurbakhsh, chairman of the Iranian part of the commission, highly evaluated the development of Iranian-Soviet economic relations over the past year. He emphasized that the

foundation of this mutually advantageous cooperation was laid in the course of the official visit to the USSR by A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and his talks with M.S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader.

The minister noted that Iran is interested in developing economic ties with various countries and especially with its neighbor the Soviet Union in industry, agriculture, transportation, trade, and other fields. The fulfilment of tasks within the framework of this cooperation will make it possible, in his words, to successfully put into life the plans made by the first Iranian Five-Year Plan of socio-economic development.

The long-term program of trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the Islamic Republic of Iran for the period up to the year 2000, as well as agreements on turnover of goods and on the construction of the Meshkhed-Serakhs-Tedzhen railway, signed in Moscow in June of last year, place specific tasks before the commission, declared N.S. Konarev. It is gratifying to note, he said, that the two countries' organizations have already started realizing the areas of cooperation planned by these important documents. Soviet-Iranian economic relations have good prospects which correspond to mutual interests, noted the chairman of the Soviet part of the commission.

The deputy leaders of the ministries and trade associations of both countries, as well as V.V. Gudev, the USSR ambassador to Iran, and N. Neyrani-Nobari, the Iranian ambassador to the USSR, are taking part in the work of the commission's present sitting.

Economic Commission Concludes Work

LD0703001990 Moscow TASS in English 2144 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Tehran March 6 TASS—The 12th meeting of the permanent commission on economic cooperation between the USSR and Iran ended in Tehran today. A protocol signed on the results of the meeting by Nikolay Konarev, chairman of the commission's Soviet part and minister of railways, and by Mohsen Nurbakhsh, Iranian minister of economic affairs and finance, sums up the results of the talks.

The document notes that the sides confirmed their interest in developing long-term economic, trade and scientific relations between the USSR and Iran.

They pointed to the importance of an agreement between the Soviet and Iranian Governments to supply the USSR with Iranian natural gas in exchange for Soviet complete plant and machines as well as assistance in the construction of industrial projects in Iran.

Speaking at the protocol-signing ceremony, the leaders of the delegations expressed satisfaction with the results of the commission's meeting as well as a mutual desire for implementing plans.

Tehran Demonstrations by War Refugees Viewed

NC0703153390 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Esteemed listeners, refugees who had been forced to leave Iranian territory seized by Iraq during the war held demonstrations in Tehran yesterday. Nearly 20,000 persons took part in these demonstrations and demanded that the United Nations expedite the departure of the Iraqi forces from the occupied areas by applying pressure on Iraq.

We know that the problem of occupied territory is one of the main impediments to an amicable solution of the Iran-Iraq conflict. According to international organizations, nearly 2,600 km of Iranian soil is occupied by Iraqi forces. Furthermore, Iranian official sources claim that Iraq is exploiting natural resources in the occupied areas including the oil reserves in Naftshahr, (Somedeh) and (Tala'iyeh).

According to Iran, UN Security Council Resolution 598 envisaged the immediate withdrawal of forces to internationally recognized borders after the declaration of the cease-fire. Tehran claims that it withdrew its military units from 3,000 square km of Iraqi territory. However Baghdad does not seem in a hurry to follow suit. Iraq wants to have the issue of occupied territory considered alongside all other questions in Iran-Iraq relations.

The Saddam Husayn government believes that the issue of occupied territory will only be resolved if an agreement is reached on the exchange of prisoners of war and freedom of navigation in the Shatt al 'Arab and Persian Gulf. Moreover, Baghdad rejects what Iran considers the internationally recognized borders and has steadfastly refused to recognize the 1975 Algiers accord. This difference has had disastrous consequences for the war refugees.

According to the IRNA, there are 84,000 war refugees in Iran. They were forced to abandon the land under Iraqi occupation and have not been able to return to their homes. In most cases, their circumstances are extremely unfortunate. In conditions of an extreme economic crisis, they are deprived of a permanent place of residence and means of livelihood and do not have any permanent employment. Most of the refugees also lost relatives in the war.

It is quite clear that the Tehran demonstrations were staged in an effort to draw the international community's attention to the refugees' sorry circumstances. About 20,000 persons asked the United Nations to accelerate its efforts for a peace accord and spur Iraq to withdraw its forces occupying Iranian territory. However, the demonstrations by the Iran-Iraq war refugees also have a subliminal political message. They indicate that pessimism and despondency are mounting in Iran over the activity of the United Nations.

Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani openly referred to this issue on 3 March in an address to the chiefs of the ground forces and criticized the United Nations for its inability to move the talks for a durable peace forward. It would not be farfetched to believe that Tehran will seek to use the demonstrations by the war refugees and their demands to the international community as a lever to exert pressure on the United Nations on the threshold of the start of a new round of talks between Iran and Iraq.

Commentary Discusses Reports on Protests in Iran

NC0603090990 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] According to reports from Iran, antigovernment protests have become more frequent in the past few days. Representatives of Iranian emigre organizations based in Athens have reported that demonstrators shouted slogans deriding the ruling Islamic fundamentalists and clashed with Islamic Revolution Guards.

Reports on antiregime demonstrations have been coming from Iran for the past 15 days. According to a spokesman for opposition organizations, these antiregime demonstrations began in Tehran on 16 February and later spread to other cities. At the end of February, clashes between demonstrators and security forces were reported in Tabriz, Mashhad, Shiraz and Hamadan.

According to REUTER, the demonstrators set up barricades in the squares and streets in the center of Esfahan and thwarted efforts by officials to crush the protest movement. It is believed that the situation is now completely under government control in the provincial centers. However, the tension in the Iranian capital does not seem to have eased.

UPI reported on 3 March that demonstrations and antiregime marches had been taking place in Tehran for the past few days. The demonstrators were demanding the removal of the Islamic fundamentalists and calling for the de-Khomeynization of Iran. The armed guards of the Islamic revolution attempted to disperse the participants in one of the demonstrations and arrested some people. According to claims by representatives of Athens-based Iranian emigre organizations, the demonstrators are demanding democratic freedoms and the establishment of a government based on the rule of law.

At least one person has been killed and others wounded in the clashes with the Islamic Revolution Guards Corps forces. The demonstrators tear down posters of the present Iranian leadership from walls. The Iranian Government has denied all reports on the incidents. The Iranian interior minister said that the rumors disseminated by foreign news media regarding extensive agitation against the Islamic Republic of Iran in Iranian cities are groundless. He emphasized that the only thing that happened was that a small group protested the postponement of a soccer match on 16 February and shouted slogans condemning the soccer federation. 'Abdollah Nuri also said that there were no disturbances in Iran before 16 February. Iranian religious leader 'Ali Khamene'i has stated that the enemies of the Islamic Revolution propagate false rumors regarding the situation in the country.

In any case, it can be said that it is extraordinarily difficult to comprehend the nature of the present events in Iran. It is difficult to obtain accurate reports in a country where the political regime lacks openness and frankness, the press is censored, and the activities of foreign correspondents are strictly controlled. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that practically all the opposition groupings, including the monarchists and the Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization, have disseminated reports of antiregime protests. Reports of bloody clashes in Tehran have been published and disseminated in Paris, London, New York, and Athens. Even the regime's officially sanctioned opposition, the Freedom Movement of Iran led by Mehdi Bazargan, issued a letter some days ago calling on the government to learn the lessons of history, refrain from totalitarianism [preceding word in English], and revise its policy before it was too late.

It is not too farfetched to wonder whether political pluralism [preceding word in English] will be incorporated into the setup of contemporary Iran.

'Goodwill' Urged in Iran-Iraq Peace Talks

NC0603104690 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The statement adopted by the UN Security Council assessing the results of the Iran-Iraq peace talks was presented to Iran and Iraq at a recent Security Council session. The UN Security Council asked UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar to convene a new round of talks to extricate the Iran-Iraq peace talks from the present stalemate within two months. It also asked Tehran and Baghdad to cooperate in the UN secretary general's efforts.

The UN Security Council's endorsement of Perez de Cuellar's mission in convening Iran-Iraq peace talks should not be considered a routine step. This statement reminds Tehran and Baghdad that members of the international community are beneficiaries of peace and security in the Persian Gulf and that patience has a limit. The impasse in the peace talks has continued for 18 months. If it goes on much longer, it is highly likely that the Security Council may raise the issue of punitive sanctions against the two sides to the conflict, which are evading a solution of this outstanding problem of the day.

The Iranian and Iraqi leaders are now studying the UN Security Council statement and preparing to meet Perez de Cuellar for separate political consultations during which the agenda for the upcoming talks will be finalized. This agenda is now being discussed in the media of the two sides. Iran believes that the agenda downplays the importance of stabilizing the cease-fire on the Iran-Iraq fronts and freedom of shipping in the Shatt al'Arab or the Arvand River and is not realistic. Iraq believes the contrary. Once again, the issue becomes snarled here and this hampers the progress of the talks. I think that the two sides should resolve the major issue between them, which is whether they are willing to live in a state of peace and good-neighborliness. All other matters are secondary. If the two sides can reach a consensus on this major issue, there will be no peripheral issue which cannot be resolved or even eliminated. Thus, the issue of the cease-fire will also become relatively less significant, since tension on the borders between the two countries is the result of wartime confrontations and encounters. The issue of shipping in the Shatt al'Arab or Arvand River is a problem which can also be easily resolved. The the two sides consider the border river a military barrier, but in other parts of the world border rivers are considered a link for peace and cooperation and an instrument of communication between governments.

By resolving the issue of sovereignty over the border river, the two sides will also be able to resolve the issue of shipping in the Persian Gulf, just as in the period before the war. Each side will have sovereignty over part of the river. In short, with the existence of peace, friendship and goodwill, a political solution of the dispute can be acheived in a very short time.

Vorontsov Talks With Visiting Pakistani Speaker

PM0603161390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 1 March Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, met with the Pakistani parliamentary delegation headed by National Assembly Speaker M.M. Khalid which is on an official visit to the Soviet Union.

There was a wide-ranging exchange of views on questions of Soviet-Pakistani relations, a political settlement of the Afghan problem, and the speediest release of the Soviet servicemen captured by the armed Afghan opposition. The sides expressed an interest in further developing and strengthening bilateral ties in various spheres.

Abdul Sattar, Pakistani ambassador to the USSR, was present during the talks.

Parliamentarians End Visit 4 Mar

LD0503211190 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—A parliamentary delegation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan left the Soviet Union on Sunday after a seven-day official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The delegation was headed by speaker of the Pakistani Parliament Malik Mairaj Khalid. In addition to Moscow, Pakistani parliamentarians visited Uzbekistan and Leningrad.

The parliamentary delegation was received by First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov.

There were meetings and conversations with Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the Soviet Parliament Rafik Nishanov, with heads of a number of committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and commissions of the Supreme Soviet chambers, and with people's deputies of the USSR. The delegation was received at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

The parliamentarians also visited the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee and the Soviet Peace Committee.

During the Soviet-Pakistani talks both sides confirmed their adherence to the principle of peaceful coexistence of states, regardless of differences in ideology, religion, socio-economic systems and political structures.

They praised international efforts aimed at eliminating regional conflicts and tension and at the consolidation of world peace.

The Soviet and Pakistani MPs [members of parliament] opposed the use of force to settle disputes and favoured their settlement by political means.

The sides expressed profound concern over the continued bloodshed in Afghanistan. It was emphasised that this problem must be resolved by peaceful political means, through the promotion of an inter-Afghan dialogue to create a broad-based government expressing the will of the whole Afghan people.

Members of the Pakistani delegation expressed hope for an early settlement, which would enable an honourable and safe return of three million Afghan refugees, now in Pakistan.

The USSR people's deputies spoke highly of the efforts taken by Pakistan to bring about the release of Soviet servicemen. They expressed hope that those efforts will be stepped up. The Pakistani MPs stated their readiness to promote an early solution to this problem.

The sides proclaimed their striving to develop Soviet-Pakistani relations and cooperation in various areas under the principles of equality, justice, mutual respect and a balance of interests.

The Pakistani delegation expressed gratitude for Soviet assistance to Pakistan in the construction and expansion of the Karachi metallurgical works and for the assistance in the implementation of other projects to develop Pakistan's economy.

The participants in the talks agreed that there are real opportunities for more fruitful contacts in the interests of the development of mutual understanding and good-neighbourliness.

The Pakistani delegation invited the USSR Supreme Soviet to send a delegation to Pakistan at a time convenient for both sides. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Israeli Communist Party Group Visits Moscow

LD1702201290 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 17 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 17 TASS—A delegation of the Communist Party of Israel paid a visit to the Soviet Union. It included Deputy General-Secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee Tewfik Toubi, member of the Central Committee Politburo Uzi Burstein and alternate member of the Politburo of the Communist Party Central Committee Salem Jubran.

The delegation was received at the International Department of the South Communist Party Central Committee.

The sides stressed the importance of real steps toward a fair settlement of the Middle East conflict on the basis of the balance of interests of all sides. They condemned brutal reprisals of the Israeli authorities on the occupied Arab territories, their unlawful settlement of immigrants, including from the Soviet Union, on Palestinian lands.

The sides expressed mutual desire to continue developing friendly ties between the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the Communist Party of Israel.

Arabic, Israeli Understanding Needed on Immigrants

TA0703090290 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1600 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Commentary by Andrey Vasilyev]

[Text] Jordanian Prime Minister Marwan al-Qasim believes that the Arab countries should work out a joint operation plan against the migration of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel. The issue will be discussed at the Arab League Foreign Ministers meeting scheduled to take place in Tunis next month.

This is what our commentator Andrey Vasilyev writes: Marwan al-Qasim made his statement at the conclusion of the Arab Cooperation Council convention, in which Jordan, Egypt, Iraq, and North Yemen are members. The body was established about a year ago as a kind of common market, but has recently dealt mainly with political issues.

The Arabs have become jittery in the wake of Yitzhaq Shamir's miserable statement saying that the absorption of aliyah requires a big Israel. It is only natural that this statement was interpreted by the Arab world as an Israeli design to settle Soviet immigrants in the territories. Since the prognosis is that some 100,000 immigrants will arrive in Israel this year, it did not take a particular effort for the Arabs to draw conclusions regarding the dangers to the West Bank and Gaza Strip demographic map.

The Soviet Union most categorically opposes any attempt to settle immigrants in the territories. The Soviet Foreign Ministry has appealed to West Germany to censure and condemn Israel's acts, which contravene the 4th Geneva Convention on relations between occupying forces and the occupied people.

This response did not satisfy the Arabs, however. [words indistinct] the easiest solution would have been to close the exit gates in the face of the Jewish emigration from the USSR. This step, however, is out of the question, because it contravenes international law. Every citizen of a law-enforcing country has the right of free movement; that right includes movement from country to country. Depriving a citizen of this right would mean shirking international responsibilities which the Soviet Union has assumed as one of the countries participating in the security conference [words indistinct]. The Arabs should understand this, particularly in view of the fact that many nationals of Arab countries themselves travel to foreign countries for work and study.

The [words indistinct] about the scope of the Soviet emigration to Israel is also connected to the fact that the U.S. Government has cut the immigration quota of Soviet citizens. The Arabs are furious but the Americans are repelling their charges, saying that the decision was made for technical reasons as well as lack of funds for the absorption of immigrants.

It should be noted, at the same time, that there is no reason why the United States should grant the Soviet immigrants the status of refugees, because our country's present emigration policy totally corresponds to international law.

It is very possible that had the prime minister not made the remarks he had, the entire problem would not have arisen. And now we [words indistinct] that Israel wants to implement the Jews' right to live in their country at the expense of the Palestinians' right to live on their land and in a state of their own. The critical development which we are witnessing now shows that peace and stability cannot be attained when one side guarantees extra privileges for himself at the expense of another. The human rights principle is binding on both Jews and Palestinian Arabs. This is the principle underlying the Soviet leadership's stance, and we hope that Israel and the Arab countries understand this.

Commentary Views Shamir's Stance on Middle East

TA1302212890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1600 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Station commentary]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The argument in the Likud party has shifted to new tracks: It now revolves around the vital issue of the peace process in the Middle East. This means that the two sides feel they can remain inactive no longer.

In fact, does Shamir's policy indeed deviate from the demands of the Likud party platform? Ostensibly, not yet. In any event, so far he has not ceded to the alignment's demand either on the question of the Palestinian representation or the clauses of Egypt's compromise proposals.

However, the endeavors of silent diplomacy continue. They are directed solely by the party's political committee, without leaving room for any influence by the Likud's radicals. The ministers believe that, if pressed by Washington, the prime minister will succumb when requested to proceed to the Cairo negotiations without guarantees. The impression is that the U.S. position was a decisive factor on the Likud radicals' resolution to go all the way this time. So far, the pressures from over the ocean have been most cautious, and the Americans have seized every opportunity to emphasize the importance of the strategic alliance. One thing is clear, however: For the first time, U.S. aid to Israel was used as a pressure factor on Israel's foreign policy. In connection with this, the constraints ministers believe that the prime minister will be unwilling to confront the double pressure of both the United States and the alignment.

What are the right-wing radicals' current chances? In the meantime, only one thing is clear: Minister Sharon's resignation announcement was a serious miscalculation. Unlike what happened in June, the prime minister managed this time to maneuver the radical opposition. It seems that he does not intend to make any more concessions to his party's radical faction—which is an encouraging sign. At the same time, there is always the possibility that the radicals will retaliate by waging an extraparliamentary struggle.

Palestinian Talks 'Will Permit' Ties With USSR

TA0503191790 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1600 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Commentary by Dimitriy Prokofyev]

[Excerpts] One after another, East European countries are resuming diplomatic relations with Israel. Three Warsaw Pact countries have already taken this step: Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and last week—Poland, too. Negotiations for the establishment of diplomatic relations between Israel and the GDR have begun. Bulgaria has announced that it will resume ties in April, and Yugoslavia intends to follow suit by mid-1990.

In connection with this, the question has often been asked in Israel and other countries: Where is the Soviet Union? Why is it staying behind? The following is our commentator Dimitriy Prokofyev's view of the issue:

Several Soviet experts on the Middle East opine that as in other political and economic spheres, the Soviet Union gave the general process of relations with Israel its first impetus, but the USSR was soon outrun by its East European allies. This was not accidental, as will be seen in several basic facts.

First, the normalization process between socialist countries and Israel began in Moscow. The Israeli consular delegation came to Moscow long before an Israeli embassy was inaugurated in Hungary—the first East European country which decided to resume diplomatic relations with Israel. [passage omitted]

Now, if all East European countries are currently declaring that the decision to sever relations in 1967 was a mistake, why has Moscow not joined the process? What is the difference between the stands of Moscow and those of the rest of the Warsaw Pact countries? Apparently, there is only one difference: The Soviet Union is an international superpower who is responsible for more than its own region. It is likewise responsible for developments in other regions, including the Middle East. Whether we justify or condemn the severing of relations in 1967, one thing is obvious: The current situation is different, and the resumption of ties will not revert it automatically to the reality of the 1960's.

While the resumption of relations between the other East European countries and Israel affects those countries only, the same step—if taken by the Soviet Union—will affect the developments in the entire Middle East right now, in 1990. And in the present situation, the Soviet Foreign Ministry officials are not certain that this impact will be beneficial. It is not inconceivable that the Likud hawks would take advantage of the renewed ties with the Soviet Union to render their stance even more inflexible. The additional risk is that the Arab side would also react with increased emotional extremism.

What can be done to defuse this danger? In my opinion, one single step suffices to render the political process in the Middle East irreversible: Begin negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, because once the negotiations are launched, they will not stop until some arrangement is found.

By the way, during his visit to Australia, Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov also said that the beginning of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations will permit the resumption of diplomatic ties between the USSR and Israel.

Commentator Criticizes Libya's al-Qadhdhafi

LD0203234290 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1430 GMT 1 Mar 90

[Text] Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, has strongly criticized the results of the presidential elections in Nicaragua and declared that

any election essentially represents a falsification of people's actual authority. Our commentator Andrey Vasilyev wrote in this context:

The negative attitude adopted by Col. al-Qadhdhafi toward the traditional democratic parliamentary institutions are very well known to all. In his theoretical work "The Green Book" he rejected in principle the idea of parliament, elections, the separation of powers, and the existence of social organizations such as the army, police, and courts. Al-Qadhdhafi's beliefs are being described as an attempt to modernize the patriarchal administrative system, even if slightly, which is implemented in any society at the stage of its development. It must be said that such theories could find a fertile ground in Libya since there was no existence of advanced or modern industry in the country until recently. There was practically no social polarization. The idea of modernizing the patriarchal administrative system has confirmed that the headman of the village was in the past usually the ruler.

Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi submitted that the whole people should be considered sovereign. It must be said that this assumption makes one raise many questions: for instance, each state needs to protect its border and guarantee its internal security. It is possible, of course, to disband the army formally and replace it with the armed people, but is there a need for the replacing of the signs, since the essence of this organization remains unchanged? And it is possible to describe a ministry as a secretariat, and the embassy as a people's bureau, but the functions do not change. Naturally, almost all the institutions necessary for the natural functioning of society exist in Libya, and the different nature of the system of authority is reflected in the existence of people's committees at the various levels, from the city to the interior of the country. Any citizen can take part in the work of the committees, and can issue a decision about any matter. What is very curious is that the opinion of Col. Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi is always decisive, a matter which confirms once again the old truth which says: when it is said that power lies in the hands of everyone, it invariably ends up quickly in the end in the hands of one man.

The majority of the theoretical and practical principles of Col. Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi are described by political observers in the Arab countries as extremist. But the Arab countries themselves are characterized by those features of political order of society which have led in Libya to the individual power of the strong leader, the contempt for the democratic measures, and the lack of understanding of the sovereignty of the individual vis-a-vis the state. There is no doubt that every people has the right to manage its own affairs in accordance with its traditions and orders. But what concerns me only is that international relations are often complicated by ongoing political issues at home. Thus the anxiety of the Arab countries of late over the growing immigration of Soviet Jews to Israel has begun to crystallize in the demand that all that is possible should be done to end the stream of immigrants. But how can a state be asked to violate its international obligations. Free movement is in the end one of the basic rights of man, and its violation means disrespect for the laws that govern the life of the international community. The non-recognition of each people's right to live as it wishes can only cause tension and chaos in international relations, and cooperation presupposes understanding and tolerance.

Yakovlev Receives Indian Marxist Delegation

PM0703164790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation from the Communist Party of India, Marxist [CPI-M] headed by E.M. Namboodiripad, general secretary of the CPI-M Central Committee, was in the Soviet Union 27 February through 6 March at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation was received by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Talks were held at CPSU Central Committee departments, the Marxism-Leninism Institute, the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and Institute of Social Sciences, and the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute.

Vorontsov Confers With Bangladesh Ambassador

PM2802105390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.M. Vorontsov has received A.K.M. Nazrul Islam, Bangladesh ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. Questions of mutual interest, including ways to a peace settlement in Afghanistan, were discussed during the talks.

Retiring Ambassador to Jordan Replaced

PM2802160590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the ge eral heading: "Chronicle"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Yuriy Stepanovich Gryadunov as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Aleksandr Ivanovich Zinchuk from his post as USSR ambassador extraordinary adn plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in connection with his retirement.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Supreme Soviet Delegation Ends Tanzania Visit

LD1203092390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0601 GMT 11 Mar 90

[Text] Dar es Salam, 11 March (TASS)—The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Yu. I. Borodin, member of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Public Health, has ended its visit to the United Republic of Tanzania. During the visit the delegation was received by Joseph Warioba, first vice president and prime minister of Tanzania.

Evaluating highly the two countries' traditionally friendly relations in the political field, the sides emphasized the need for further development and perfection of trade and economic ties. They noted that the latest changes in Tanzania's foreign economic policy and the reforms in the USSR are creating favorable conditions for this. They exchanged views on the latest events in Southern Africa. They also noted their common assessments of the situation taking shape there.

On Saturday evening the delegation departed from Tanzania.

Mandela Completes Working Visit to Tanzania

MB1303108590 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 12 Mar 90

[(Vitaliy Vilaborodko) report—read by announcer]

[Text] Nelson Mandela, a prominent fighter against apartheid, completed his visit to Tanzania on 11 March. When the crowd of reporters, who had arrived from all over the world, broke through the police lines and surrounded Mr. Mandela at the airplane ramp, Julius Nyerere, who had just embraced his guest, told the guards to let the reporters alone. They are recording history, he said.

That is indeed so. It is difficult to describe the enthusiasm and hospitality with which Tanzania welcomed Nelson Mandela. Hundreds of thousands of people stood under pouring rain to greet the great son of Africa along the entire route from the airport to Dar es Salaam. The streets and squares of the city were decorated with the flags of the African National Congress [ANC], with the portraits of its leaders, and streamers saying, Mandela, We Love You; De Klerk, Listen To Mandela. Mr. Mandela was made an honorary citizen of Dar es Salaam, and presented with the symbolic key to the city. One of its motorways was renamed after him, and the government awarded him the Order of Kilimanjaro.

It would be wrong to think, however, that Mr. Mandela's visit to Tanzania was all ceremony and rejoicing. It was, to a considerable extent, a working visit. As vice president of the ANC, Mr. Mandela met the leaders of the ruling Revolutionary Party of Tanzania, visited the camps of refugees from South Africa, and addressed mass meetings in Dar es Salaam and Zanzibar. Altering the itinerary of his visit, he went to Addis Ababa for a day , where he had consultations with the leaders of the Organization of African Unity and Ethiopia.

All this leads us to conclude that the ANC is now developing new strategies and tactics to meet the needs of the current stage of political developments in South Africa. The main burden of this work is now being shouldered by Mr. Mandela as the president of the ANC. Oliver Tambo, has been in a hospital in Stockholm for quite some time due to a heart condition.

It is believed that on the whole, the leadership of the ANC wants a peaceful solution to the problem of apartheid in South Africa. Speaking at a meeting in Dar es Salaam on 7 March, Mr. Mandela stated now that the ban on its activity has been lifted, the ANC would return to South Africa, but not with a feeling of vindictiveness and a striving to destroy, but with the intention to establish peace and happiness for the entire population of the country regardless of skin color. And at the same meeting, the chairman of the Revolutionary Party of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, stressed: We are opposed to apartheid, but not to white people. Naturally the ANC will only be able to keep to its peaceful line in solving political problems if the De Klerk government does the same.

When Mr. Mandela was a child, he drew the name of [word indistinct], which means, mischief-maker. The boy's school teacher, a white man, started calling him Nelson because he could not pronounce his name, or for some other reason. The new name stuck, but did not change his character. Even today, at 71, and with his health—the health of a heavyweight boxer in the past—that deteriorated during his long years in prison, Nelson Mandela remains the epicenter of a disaster area for the leadership of South Africa. After 27 years behind bars, he is once again in the ranks of the antiapartheid fighters.

East Europe

First Soviet Troops Depart Hungary 12 Mar

LD1203195690 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Budapest March 12 TASS—Today, an echelon with a motorised rifle battalion of the Budapest-Nikolayevsk Guards Armoured Division left the railway station of the city of Hajmasker, Hungary, and headed towards the Soviet-Hungarian border.

This military echelon was the first of 2,000 echelons which are to transport Soviet military personnel, hardware and equipment from Hungary before the end of June 1991 in accordance with a Soviet-Hungarian intergovernmental agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops signed recently.

According to the withdrawal schedule, 70 percent of military units, including 65 percent of the Air Force, will leave Hungary by the end of the year, in the first stage. In the second stage, which ends in Feburary 1991, 90 percent of all military units will be withdrawn, including the whole of the Air Force. The remaining 10 percent, mostly motorised rifle units, will be loading equipment during the whole of the withdrawal period and will eventuallly leave Hungary.

Text of Agreement on Soviet Troop Withdrawal

AU1303091390 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 11 Mar 90 p 2

["Agreement on the Withdrawal of Soviet Troops Temporarily Stationed on the Territory of the Hungarian Republic"]

[Text] Guided by their efforts to develop the friendly and good-neigborly relations between the Hungarian Republic and the USSR and consistently adhering to the basic principles of international law stipulated in the UN Statute and in the CSCE Final Document, including adherence to the principle of sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, the government of the Hungarian Republic and the government of the USSR (the two sides) regard the withdrawal of Soviet troops temporarily stationed in Hungary as an organic part of their joint efforts to strengthen European and international confidence and security, and have agreed on the following:

Article 1. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic will commence on 12 March 1990 and will be completed by 30 June 1991.

To be withdrawn are the entire personnel of the Soviet troops, including the Soviet civilian employees and their weapons, combat equipment, and materiel.

The appendix of this agreement contains the schedule for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic, and this appendix is an integral part of this agreement.

Article 2. The government of the Hungarian Republic will contribute to guaranteeing the conditions necessary for implementing the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary's territory.

Article 3. Transportation of Soviet troops and the elimination of various materials and waste remaining in Hungary will be carried out while taking into consideration the interests of the civilian population and observing the regulations for environmental protection.

Article 4. The training and combat activity of the Soviet troops stationed on the territory of the Hungarian Republic—including flights—will be limited.

Article 5. The two sides will nominate their representatives to guarantee the implementation of this agreement, to supervise the orderly withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic, and to register, evaluate, hand over, or sell the various installations and materials by coordinated methods.

Article 6. Until the final withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic, the legal status of the Soviet troops, and the property law, financial, and other issues concerning the temporary deployment of Soviet troops in Hungary will be determined by the agreement on the legal status of the Soviet troops temporarily stationed on the territory of the Hungarian People's Republic signed between the government of the Hungarian People's Republic and the government of the USSR on 27 May 1957, as well as by the stipulations of other valid Hungarian-Soviet agreements.

Article 7. The property, financial, and other economic issues concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops that are not included in the valid agreements will be regulated by separate agreements. The two sides will take immediate steps to deal with the aforementioned questions by the time of the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Article 8. The two sides will settle disputed issues in respect of the interpretation and application of this agreement, as well as the implementation of the withdrawal in accordance with the planned schedule, within 30 days of the date of submitting the same, in the framework of the joint Hungarian-Soviet commission established on the basis of Article No. 17 of the agreement on the legal status of the Soviet troops temporarily stationed on the territory of the Hungarian People's Republic, signed between the government of the Hungarian People's Republic and the USSR Government on 27 May 1957.

If the joint commission is unable to decide on any submitted question, the dispute must be settled through diplomatic channels.

Article 9. The stipulations of this agreement do not apply to the obligations deriving from the existing bilateral and multilateral agreements, including those deriving from the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Aid signed in Warsaw on 14 May 1955.

Article 10. This agreement shall enter into force on the day it is signed.

Drawn up in Moscow, on 10 March 1990, in two original copies, each in the Hungarian and Russian languages, both texts being authentic.

[Appendix referred to in Article 1 above is not published]

Hungarian Parties Warned on Pace of Withdrawal

PM1203113690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conference in Budapest"]

[Text] Budapest, 8 Mar—A conference of representatives of the government and of the 12 most influential parties in Hungary has been held here to discuss questions connected with the Soviet troop withdrawal from the country's territory.

F. Somogyi, state secretary at the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, briefed the forum participants on the progress of the Soviet-Hungarian talks on this question. He pointed out, in particular, that the Hungarian side seeks the speediest Soviet troop withdrawal. At the same time it wishes to conclude an agreement on this question in such a way that it will not have an unfavorable influence on the future shape of Hungarian-Soviet relations. Therefore it would be inexpedient to advance demands in ultimatum terms during the talks with the Soviet partners. Account must be taken of the problems associated with the removal of a large quantity of military hardware and material and technical means from the country.

The state secretary invited three representatives of each of the 12 parties [as published] to participate in the troop withdrawal talks as observers.

V.M. Falin Confers With Hungarian Ambassador

PM0803123390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] V.M. Falin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, received S. Gyorke, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR, and had a conversation with him on questions of mutual interest.

Shevardnadze Meets Romanian Foreign Minister

PM1203095790 Moscow IZVESTIYA Morning Edition in Russian 10 Mar 90 p 4

["On the Working Visit to the USSR of Romanian Foreign Minister S. Celac"—unattributed report]

[Text] Romanian Foreign Minister S. Celac was in Moscow on 8 March, on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

"During the talks that were held, E. A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and S. Celac exchanged information on the processes of democratic transformation, which are underway in the USSR and in Romania. They also examined a wide range of issues pertaining to Soviet-Romanian relations and exchanged opinions on the key problems of international life. The ministers confirmed the determination of their countries to develop Soviet-Romanian relations on a new, healthy, and mutually beneficial basis, proceeding from the principles of independence, sovereignty, equality of rights, noninterference in internal affairs, territorial integrity, mutual trust, and freedom of choice.

The expansion of bilateral contacts in the political, economic, cultural, humanitarian, and other areas was noted with satisfaction. The ministers stressed the importance and significance of achieving practical results in cooperation in the interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the Romanian people. Agreement was reached to complete very soon preparations for signing agreements on reciprocal travel by citizens of the two countries, as well as on opening information and cultural centers in Moscow and Bucharest. The sides agreed to examine the matter of opening general consulates—of the USSR in Iasi and of Romania in Kishinev.

During a discussion of the key problems of foreign policy, the sides noted the coincidence or proximity of their views on the changes taking place in the world and expressed their committment to deepening cooperation on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis in order to strengthen universal peace, security, and broad-based international cooperation.

The talks took place in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere and confirmed the sides' mutual desire to consolidate relations of friendship and good-neighborliness between the Soviet Union and Romania."

Romanian Subway, Mine Workers' Strikes Eyed

PM1203163790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Mar 90 Single Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Wave of Strikes in Romania"]

[Text] Bucharest, 11 Mar—While members of the Provisional National Unity Council [PNUC] are discussing ways of making the transition to a market economy in heated debates at their council sessions, workers at many of Romania's enterprises are making the situation in the economy even more difficult by demanding higher wages and improved food supplies.

The month-long negotiations between the leaders of Bucharest subway workers' trade unions and government representatives ended in two days of strike action. Only when passenger transport in the city was virtually paralyzed did the authorities become concerned and begin to consider the subway workers' demands.

Measures have been taken and the strike is over, but we still have a great deal of problems, S. Stoian, a mechanic at one of the subway strations, told your TASS correspondent. We have no economic independence, we do not have the material base we need, there are frequent shortages of elementary spare parts, and there is nowhere to obtain them either: There is no market.

The strike by miners at the Vulcan Mine, supported by more than 15,000 miners, has had a broader impact. It also has considerable political significance, because during the difficult period when some forces were trying

to oust the country's present leadership, it was the miners who came to their aid in the capital.

Nevertheless, many of the demands they made at the beginning of this year, which the authorities promised to meet, have remained on paper. For three days the miners tried to secure a special government decision that would make it possible to create normal working conditions and ensure that the mines have the apparatus and equipment they need.

After Saturday's talks, the miners' leaders announced that they will end their strike but that if the miners' demands are not considered at a session of the PNUC by 15 March—the date set by the authorities—the strike action will be continued. The newspapers have pointed out that during these three days enterprises have lost more than 20,000 tonnes of coal.

Message to Bulgarian Leaders on Liberation Day

PM0503101590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[USSR leadership bodies' undated message of congratulations to Bulgarian leaders on Liberation Day]

[Text] To Comrade Petur Mladenov, chairman of the People's Republic of Bulgaria State Council

To Comrade Andrey Lukanov, chairman of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Council of Ministers

Please accept our cordial congratulations on the national holiday—the day of Bulgaria's liberation from the Ottoman yoke.

Soviet people associate this significant date with the traditions of our peoples' age-old friendship. We express the hope that mutual understanding and trust and everything positive and good that has been accumulated over the decades in relations between our people will be preserved and will serve the interests of both our countries at the new stage in their history and will become an important element in progressive, democratic transformations in Europe and in strengthening new foundations of international security and cooperation.

We wish you and the entire Bulgarian people well-being and successes in implementing the planned transformations.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

Poll Says Most Bulgarians Would Vote for BCP

PM1303090390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Mar 90 Single Edition p3

[TASS report: "Bulgaria: Election Themes"]

[Text] Sofia, 11 Mar—If the national parliamentary elections were to be held now, the majority of voters would support the BCP [Bulgarian Communist Party] in them. These are the results of a survey conducted by the National Public Opinion Research Center attached to the Bulgarian National Assembly. According to the survey, 39 percent of the vote would go to the BCP and 15 percent to the opposition UDF [Union of Democratic Forces]. If the head of state were to be elected in a direct ballot, P. Mladenov, chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, would secure the greatest number of votes.

The forthcoming elections to the National Assembly are increasingly coming to determine the course of Bulgaria's turbulent political life. The opposition is concerned with achieving unity. Precisely this is the objective of the first national conference of opposition forces being held in the city of Plovdiv. A total of 27 political parties, associations, clubs, and movements are taking part in it.

Instead of the desired cohesion, the conference has revealed contradictions between the UDF, which incorporates about 15 different parties and organizations, and the political opposition bloc uniting six parties. Despite this, however, the UDF and a number of organizations which are not associated with any bloc signed the "Statement on Uniting the Democratic Opposition" on Saturday. According to BTA, the document places all blame for the country's present difficult position on the BCP. It claims that the change in the country's leadership "has not affected the essence of totalitarianism."

At a mass rally held in Plovdiv the same day, UDF leader Zh. Zhelev reiterated the demand already made by the union leaders for June elections to the Great National Assembly, which will be tasked with drafting the country's new constitution.

The election theme also clearly came across at yesterday's UDF rally in the city of Stanke-Dimitrov, at this union's organizational conference in Shumen, and at a demonstration by the federation of independent student societies, incorporated in the UDF, in the Bulgarian capital.

MOSCOW NEWS Profiles Political Groups

PM0903122690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 9, 27 Feb-5 Mar 90 pp 13-15

[Vladimir Zhitomirskiy dispatch: "How Many Parties Does a Republic Need?]

[Text] Sofia—In various parts of Sofia one can often see groups of people standing at the walls of buildings, most often at the corners. They read the leaflets and programmes by various parties, movements, and organizations. Quite a few of them exist in Bulgarian today.

Let us have a close look at this wide spectrum of political associations. Some of them might look excessively bold, even unnaturally so. But they really exist.

The Bulgarian Social Democratic Party

Reception hours are noted on the door of Grudi Panchev's flat. Chief secretary of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party, he has turned his not quite spacious home into the headquarters of his party. When I came in that heavy, grey-headed man with massive features, was busy instructing a colleague, also an elderly man, and giving him a bunch of leaflets.

"Excuse me," Grudi Panchev said, "I have to send someone to the provinces."

With a naked eye I could see that Grudi's flat has ceased being a place to live in. Piles of documents were lying on the sofa, chairs, and the floor. I managed to find an easy chair with a broken elbow-rest and sat down. Grudi spoke unhurriedly as if seeing the whole history of his party in his mind's eye.

Next year will mark the birth centenary of his party. Most of the founders were young people. Some of them had arrived from Russia, others had got education in West European countries. Those from Russia introduced revolutionary thinking and revolutionary methods of struggle against autocracy. Those who studied in Western Europe introduced free-thinking, democratism, and the parliamentary methods of struggle. In 1903 the party split into two groups. One of them, the Tesnyaks, formed their own party. As a result of its subsequent reorganization there appeared the Bulgarian Communist Paty (BCP). The other group, "broad-minded socialists," formed the Bulgarian Workers' Social Democratic Party (united). Its founder, Yanko Sakyzov, subsequently became a government minister. Thanks to him, in 1919 Bulgaria got an 8-hour working day. That party maintained close contacts with the trade unions and supported the development of cooperation. During the war Social Democrats joined the anti-fascist movement. In 1948 the party was actually abolished. Its leaders and representatives in the National Assembly were declared spies and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. Many of them perished in prison.

I asked Grudi Panchev about his life.

"I am lucky," he said smiling, "I spent only 11 years in jails and camps."

Having got freedom in 1959, the former "spy's" record at major construction projects was very good and earned him two orders and many other honorary awards. And all those years he remained a member of the Social Democratic Party.

"How was that, with the party abolished?" I wondered.

"Look," Grudi gave me an official document dated the previous day.

I saw two stamps, seals, and signatures. The Sofia municipal court corroborated the fact of the registration of the Bulgarian Workers' Social Democratic Party as a political organization in 1945. What was that document for? I learnt that the party, routed and declared a spy den, had never been officially banned and that now it continued its activities.

What are the goals of the party? According to Grudi Panchev, his party is trying to revive the ideas of democracy. It wants to see Bulgaria free and democratic, and, with the use of its natural wealth and economic opportunities, including market economy, ensuring a good and happy life to its citizens. Meanwhile, the task is to form party organizations in all communities and to try to get back at least some of the party property. Last January the party changed its name into the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party. The first issue of its newspaper has already come off the press.

Grudi Panchev is on pension now. But he works 20 hours a day, having meetings and talks, and preparing leaflets. He notes that he is trying to make up for the years when he had to keep silent. And, he says, he draws strength from his love of hiking and mountain-climbing. Hundreds of times he climbed Mt. Vitosha and dozens of times he conquered the almost three-kilometre high Mt. Musala.

The same evening a sociopolitical rating of the popularity of political parties, movements, and organizations was telecast. Social Democrats were rated the last. Second to none were ecologists, members of the Ecoglasnost Movement.

Ecoglasnost

I had a talk with Petur Slabakov, head of the Ecoglasnost Movement, in his dressing room. He is a well-knwon actor of the Satire Theatre in Sofia. What had made that lively, 66-year-old man take up voluntary work?

"I have been closely connected with land," he said, "My father worked on the land. I myself worked as a tractor driver. And I am an economist by education. I had no desire to work for the community. One needs either a desire, or some special gift for that. But I came to see that the environments kept perishing and that people died prematurely. This has become particularly obvious over the past 20 years. We have dug up the whole of the earth in search of minerals. Or take the Kremikovtsi Works. It has become a cancerous growth of Bulgaria, Sofia in the first place. The air in the capital city is such as it is hard to breathe. The current limits of pollution have been far exceeded. The ecological movement came into existence in Bulgaria approximately two years ago. At first it existed as the Ecological Committee for the Protection of the town of Ruse. That organization was not given an opportunity to exist. Some of its leaders were expelled from the party. (Their membership in the BCP has been restored after November 10, 1989, when Zhivkov was removed.) At that time Ecoglasnost was set up. At first there were 9 of us. Later on the membership reached 29 people. Today there are more than 10,000 of us. If we are given access to radio and television we shall have 100,000 members by this coming May.

"Several days after my joining the Committee for the Protection of Ruse, during the performance, disregarding my part in the play, right from the stage I read the appeal of our organization to help that suffocating city. The next day I was summoned to the Political Bureau. I remember that Grisha Filipov, Emil Khristov, and other top leaders were among those present. I was accused of an intention to form a Green Party. I said then: 'In the fifties, when there was an intention to stigmatize anyone, he was declared a "Titoist" or a "Traichokostovist," today the name is a "Green." ' I was expelled from the BCP on three occasions already. The first was when I had been quite young and worked as a tractor driver. They saw a 'Traichokostovist' in me. The second time was in 1956, as part of the preventive measures after the Poznan events in Poland. The third time was in the sixties, when the theatre in Burgas, where I had worked, was accused of formalism. Examination was staged. I could not stand it. I told those 'art critics' what I thought of them, and slammed the door behind me."

"What is the framework of Ecoglasnost?" I asked.

"We have a 31-man council, a secretary and an auditing committee. No payments is given to anyone. The activists include eminent scientists and scholars: biologists, ecologists, physicists, jurists, sociologists, and experts in other fields. Formerly the protectors of the environment were accused of incompetence. Today such accusations would sound proofless. There exists even a research institute whose entire staff help Ecoglasnost. However, sometimes you can clearly see river pollution even without a microscope. Quite recently we were reported from the city of Byala that with the air temperature of minus 23 Centigrade, the Yantra River had not frozen up. With a lot of chemical impurities, its waters seem to have turned into an antifreeze. This fact alone speaks volumes. We haven't got a single river or lake with pure water any longer now," Petur Slabakov said ruefully.

"What is Ecoglasnost really doing? What can it do?" I asked.

"I am afraid that we have realized all this too late," said Petur with bitterness. "The current ecological situation holds the country by the throat, if it can be put this way. One of the professors stated that an AIDS medicine could be made, whereas no remedy could be created to combat 'ecological AIDS.' What about our concrete actions? For instance, the plans of reversing the course of one of our rivers have appeared in our country. But the experience of the Soviet Union has already shown that the diversion of a stream from its channel is very dangerous and unnatural. We resolutely came out against that. We sent letters with our well-reasoned objections to various departments, top-level included. We also noted that the project had been too expensive for our small country. It has been estimated at 1,500 million, but you certainly know that in socialist economy actual expenses greatly differ from the estimate."

"So, you send letters. What else can your organization do?" I asked.

"We hold meetings," said Petur Slabakov, "always on days off, not to interfere with production. I met Petur Mladenov. I told him that our organization believed that it was necessary to dismiss Georgi Atanasov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Petur Petrov, Minister of Civil Engineering, Architecture, and Urban Development. And I mentioned our arguments for that. For instance, Atanasov is a representative of two authorities at once: legislative and executive. Petur Mladenov listened to me attentively, but said nothing."

Several days after that conversation the government of Atanasov handed in its resignation.

The Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union

I met Angel Dimitrov, Secretary of the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union (BAPU).

"How have the tasks of your party changed today in comparison with yesterday?" I asked him.

"Beginning with November 10, 1989, the tasks of our Agrarian Union keep changing. We announced that we were forming an independent party which would actively work, on an equal footing with others, in the spirit of political pluralism. It stands to reason that we had to draft our own programme. We had never got such a progamme since September 9, 1944. We adopted a programme of building socialism with the Bulgarian Communist Party playing the leading role. In a new programme we had to define the tasks and forms of the participation of our party in the establishment of a new life in Bulgaria. Proceeding from that we had to compile our new rules. Today, at the pre-congress party conference, we are critically discussing those drafts. We are working on a special address to the members of the agrarian party. In a sense it is an election programme.

"The main problem for us is the situation in the Bulgarian countryside, in our agriculture which should really have priority significance in the life of the country. We held a special meeting of our guiding council. The subject was "The Bulgarian Countryside and Agriculture." We came out against whatever administration by orders and decrees in this area. We shall come out in favour of a new taxation, credit and price policy.

"We are categorically against obligatory government contracts. A market mechanism should be gradually introduced. And it is necessary to do away with the monopoly of purchasing organizations. An end should be put to the plundering of the countryside by various government bodies, with all sorts of their insurance and other impositions. A real self-government should be established in the countryside and the whole of agricultural production. True democracy should exist there.

"The second problem of major importance which faces us refers to our political system. The years of our joint

work with the Bulgarian Communists are most precious to us, although that period had witnessed its ups and downs. However, the nature of cooperation should change under the new conditions. The main concern is that, frankly speaking, perestroyka is under way only in Sofia now. People have got tired of talks about various kinds of ideas and models. There are no changes at the grassroots level. The only possible change can be a roundabout of officials, when first secretary becomes chairman of a local council, and the latter takes the post of the former. Every Monday first secretaries have the same operations meetings. And management by orders and decrees still exists in all areas. All this is to the detriment of the Bulgarian Communist Party, and to the advantage of the opposition: the Union of Democratic Forces and to a certain extent, to the advantage of our party.

"We are the martyrs, because they want to manipulate us in the conditions of perestroyka as well. This should be clearly seen. We worked side by side with the Communists, and we do not easily part with our common principles. But everyone should see that new times have come, and there is no reversing the process."

"Great changes have taken place in the countryside. Many people have left it for the town. How to bring them back to agriculture? What can be done to have new and hard-working countryfolk"?, I asked.

"That can be achieved only with the aid of economic policy, economic incentives, the mechanisms of economic management. But this is not the crux of the matter. Today approximately 18 to 20 per cent of the population work in agriculture—quite a lot even by the current standards. Ten to twelve per cent would be sufficient if they had modern equipment and if the state pursued a consistent economic policy. We have never had such a policy. All the time we try somehow to cheat the producer. Even today new purchasing prices have appeared. But the purchasing price of the milk bought from cooperatives and state farms is much higher than that which exists for individual peasants.

"Meantime, a producer wants to know the purchasing price of his produce at least for five years ahead. Moreover, there should be several purchasing organizations. Every farmer should have the right of directly selling his produce on the market and the right to choose. A farmer should get at least half of the hard currency his produce brings in. Today he does not receive a cent. A producer gets 16 to 18 percent of what his produce fetches, while he should get at least 50 per cent.

"By the way, the BAPU was formed in 1899, after the peasant revolts against the state taking 10 per cent of their produce in taxation. Today 80 per cent and even more is taken. If we launch a new policy, if the community starts collecting taxes and using them for the development of the countryside, there will be no need of persuading people to come back there. They will come back to the countryside of their own free will. By the way, there were already two attempts of renewing the countryside. Subsidies were given. People got them and returned to the town. A stable economic policy alone can solve this problem."

"But there also exists one more agrarian party, your rival, so to speak.. Am I right?"

"In 1947, the BAPU split up into two groups. One of them adopted socialism and sided with the Communist Party. The other, Headed by Nikola Petkov, was in opposition. It was routed and outlawed. Petkov was hanged. Thousands of party members were subjected to repression. Some managed to emigrate. Today our parliament has politically rehabilitated the entire former opposition, including the Nikola Petkov BAPU. This union exists parallel with us. We conduct active negotiations with it with a view to uniting. We have already come to an agreement on many questions. They even believe that we have taken our programme from them. In any case, both sides unite around this programme. One problem divides us. They say: 'Leave the government.' And we say to them: 'Leave the Union of Democratic forces.' If they do, we shall be able to leave the government. (Merely a few days after the resignation of the Atanasov government, when Andrey Lukanov was asked to form a new government, the agrarian party refused to participate in it.—V. Zh.). I am sure that sooner or later we shall unite. The interests of Bulgaria call for this. We have no fundamental differences as regards goals or programmatic principles. On the whole, we can be optimistic about our uniting. I think, it should happen before the elections. Otherwise both we and they will be the losers."

"What is your opinion of the latest BCP congress?", I asked.

"I think that it has launched the process of perestroika," Angel Dimitrov said. "I don't know whether I am right or wrong, but to my mind, the conservative forces still hold important positions. However, there are also other forces which come in favour of perestroyka. And we support them."

Developments take their normal course. In mid-February BAPU representatives announced that they were going to act on its own as an independent organization.

Meanwhile the latest opinion poll has shown that alongside the general approval of the 'round table" talks held by representatives of various parties, the interest in such meetings is waning. The reason for this is seen in the failure to produce concrete agreements, in the ultimatum-like character of some statements, and in the drawn-out, sterile debate....

Bulgarian Sociopolitical Frictions Viewed

PM0803154590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[Special correspondent A. Zhukov dispatch: "Bulgaria: With Hope for the Better"]

[Excerpt] Varna-Veliko Turnovo-Moscow—[Passage omitted]. "With the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] to Communism!" and "If You Want to Live, Vote for the Union of Democratic Forces of Bulgaria" These two slogans which I saw on adjacent walls in the center of Varna perhaps best reflect the polarization of opinion that has occurred throughout Bulgarian society. The changes in Sofia's upper echelons of power took place rapidly and bloodlessly. But not painlessly. In the sense that the abuses committed by T. Zhivkov's family and his entourage have inflicted incomparable damage on the prestige of the party and, of course, its leadership.

The country and the remaining BCP leadership are now faced with clearly difficult tasks. There are demonstrations in the capital and in the provinces. Strikes at enterprises and even attempts by extremists to destroy Georgi Dimitrov's mausoleum are only superficial manifestations of the crisis. But you cannot feed people, heat homes, or improve lives merely by pointing out these kind of facts. What way out is there? By radically smashing what is outmoded, and by perestroyka. The party has begun the perestroyka by restructuring itself.

Today there is no talk in the BCP of "monolithic unity." Not only because for decades these words covered up blatant persecution of any—albeit insignificant—dissent for decades. People within the party believe that truth is born of argument. That is why both "radicals" and "traditionalists" are getting along together under one roof, while the party documents adopted by the extraordinary 14th BCP Congress expressed the rational elements of all platforms within the party.

The renunciation of the monopoly on truth has become the cornerstone on which party work is based today. Moreover, in many respect intraparty "opposition" has generated ideas, which are being put into practice by the BCP. The party structure has changed—it has become two-tiered: The Supreme Council is a commune committee. All party bodies have become elective on an exclusively multiple-candidate basis, moreover the leader cannot hold his post for more than four years.

The decision to eliminate numerous apparatchik privileges, reduce the number of apparatchiks to the level of "reasonable need," and make it compulsory for all leaders to submit declarations of income has been of tremendous significance for strengthening party prestige.

But, if we are talking specifically, according to public opinion polls 35-37 percent of those polled are prepared to vote for the BCP. For the sake of comparison only 20 percent of those polled are willing to vote for the country's second largest political organization—in terms of significance—the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union. Incidentally, according to some estimates, there will be no more than a 5-6-percent drop in the numerical strength of the Communist Party. Of course, the situation may change nearer the elections. But most of the Bulgarian working class favor the BCP. A renewed BCP.

Nevertheless there is no room for complacency in BCP ranks. Above all because the opposition in the form of the Union of Democratic Forces of Bulgaria is also scoring points day by day, week by week. Advocating the creation of a "second Bulgarian republic, a new state system, and a new constitution," the Union of Democratic Forces of Bulgaria is striving to introduce private ownership and a market economy based thereon, openly rejecting the actual concept of "socialism." That is why it is no coincidence that the union is mainly supported by those people who had had something to lose in bourgeois Bulgaria—the elite among the intelligentsia, big bosses in the Bulgarian countryside, and the private operators, which have already emerged in the sphere of services and production [sentence as published].

Nor are relations between political parties and the organs of power straightforward under current conditions. The lack of trust in the BCP party elite has catalyzed the population's mistrust of the local authorities, which are generally headed by Communists. They were immediately reminded both of the mania to build giant plants without the raw materials to supply them and the environmental pollution caused by the new industrial enterprises' smokestacks in traditionally touristic and agricultural areas, and the passion to live the high life at state expense. Taking advantage of these sentiments, the opposition has waged a decisive struggle for seats on commune councils.

The democratization of the country's political life has also increased local authorities' activity, which in many respects conflicts with the opinion held by the center. The question of shutting down a number of enterprises in Bulgaria which are doing irreparable damage to the environment and to man has arisen with particular trenchancy. The problem of the chemical production in the city of Ruse, where—as a result of the continuous discharge of chlorine into the atmosphere—severe lesions, caused by these noxious gases, can be observed in the respiratory organs of many inhabitants, especially among children, has become the talk of the town. Under public pressure the okrug authorities intend to cut priduction. The metallurgical plant in Kremikovtsi, "chemical valley" 40 km from Varna, and the Kozloduy nuclear electric power station give rise to just as great complaints. Whether the local authorities like it or not, they cannot pass over these problems in silence.

Political and economic decentralization is also manifest in the fact that the country's new government headed by A. Lukanov intends—and is already putting this into practice—to coordinate its main steps and actions with the opinion of all political forces represented in the country's parliament. That is not a sign of weakness or lack of confidence in its own powers but, on the contrary,

an attempt to consolidate the country and the people on a new democratic foundation in the spirit of pluralism of approach and opinion. It is still difficult to tell how far this will be successful but it is important that the government does understand the specific nature and urgency of the tasks of restructuring society. And this includes an understanding of the ways of developing it.

Now a word about another problem which has been throwing the country into ferment for several months. The situation and the political struggle in Bulgaria today is also aggravated by the nationality question, which deteriorated last summer and fall, in particular the problem of the Turkish-speaking and Muslim population. T. Zhivkov's mistaken and harmful policy on the nationality question, along with the vigorous activity carried out by foreign special services and propaganda, incited hundreds of thousands of people to a desperate step—to leave the homeland. They went for good, selling up their property, and abandoning their homes. However the euphoria of the "easy life" in Turkey quickly passed and most of those who left have returned. And they by no means met with a kind reception, particularly from the local authorities. The momentum of the vigorous propaganda campaign, which accused those who left vitually of treason, also took its toll. So tension arose locally which then develooped into ethnic friction.

"Saying that our country and the Communist Party are now living under emergency conditions, is only half the truth," Apostol Dimitrov, secretary of the BCP Varna Commune Committee, said, sharing his thoughts with me. "We are experiencing a period when the strength of the idea of socialism is being tested. And, as the ancients used to say, we will have one choice: victory or defeat."

'Socialist' Dropped From Title of Czech Republic

PM0703113190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS dispatch: "Republic Title Changed"]

[Text] Prague, 6 Mar—At a session of the Czech National Council today a law was passed on changing the title of the Czech Socialist Republic.

Czech Republic—this is the new title of one of the two republics which make up the Czechoslovak Federation. Earlier the Slovak parliament voted in the new title of the Slovak Republic.

A number of deputies of the republic parliament proposed that the property of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia be nationalized, accusing the party of abuses over the past 40 years. The Czech National Council left this question open.

CSSR's Mohorita on CPCZ's Future Role

PM0903155390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Criticism Leveled at Communists"]

[Text] The published election program of the CPCZ [Czechoslovak Communist Party] is the program of a reviving Communist Party, which continues to search for its place in the pluralistic political system taking shape in the CSSR. This was emphasized by V. Mohorita, first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, when speaking at a press conference here for Czechoslovak and foreign journalists.

Having indicated the importance of concerted action in parliament, he reported that an intraparliamentary CPCZ deputies club had been formed. Previously Communists' work in the Federal Assembly was often of a formal nature. Now, that the Communist Party has lost its assembly majority and has only 40 percent of deputies' seats, purposeful and coordinated efforts are needed. The club's activity is chiefly directed toward effectively supporting the constructive changes taking place in the republic.

V. Mohorita reported that at present the party has around 1 million members—700,000 fewer than there were before. As before the situation remains complex. Communists accept criticism of the CPCZ, specifically criticism in the mass media, but we do not agree with the distortion of facts and frivolous approach to assessing the past 42 years, he stated. Communists who occupied leading positions are now switching to ordinary jobs, although not all are finding work. Sometimes they are refused jobs purely because of their CPCZ membership.

The Central Committee first secretary noted in conclusion that the Communist Party has learned the serious lessons of what an unchecked monopoly of power leads to, and will never seek it. The formation of a new society is just beginning and the CPCZ does not intend to play the role of an eternal convict. At the same time it does not want to appear as the sole force, which knows better than everybody else how everything should be done and which preaches to others. The Communist Party is ready to enter the ranks of the opposition, but it must be a constructive opposition.

Dubcek Urges 'Constructive Development Program'

PM0503103790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Session's Results"]

[Text] Prague, 2 Mar—A session of the CSSR Federal Assembly ended here yesterday. The deputies adopted a new electoral law according to which a general election will be held 8 June, and discussed a report by CSSR Premier M. Calfa on the sociopolitical and economic situation in the country.

A detailed resolution adopted on this question points out, in particular, that the government has not yet succeeded in elaborating a real concept of economic development with due regard for the need for structural changes in the national economy and an orientation toward expanding foreign economic ties.

Addressing the session, Parliament Chairman A. Dubcek pointed out that the CSSR Federal Assembly's chief task at the present stage is to fulfill its legislative and controlling function and to adopt a number of new laws before the elections. Speaking of the government's activity, he emphasized that what is needed now instead of revolutionary improvisation is a constructive development program.

In connection with the approaching 45th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation from the fascist invaders A. Dubcek pointed to the Soviet Union's key role. However, according to him, the armies of the other allied states should also now be given their due, but this does not signify a belittling of the role of the Resistance under the Communist Party's leadership. The parliament chairman warned against the development of processes in the CSSR which would play "into the hands of neo-Stalinist forces in the USSR."

Czechoslovak Envoy Received at Foreign Ministry

PM1203144990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general headinbg: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister, received R. Slansky, CSSR ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request 11 March.

West Europe

Turkish Minister on Economic Ties With USSR

LD2802151290 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 28 Feb 90

[Text] Istanbul February 28 TASS—By TASS correspondent Azer Dzhangirov:

As the Soviet Union fulfills its reforms, Turkish-Soviet economic relations will expand, Turkish Minister of Finance and Customs Ekrem Pakdemirli told the third general session of the Soviet-Turkish mixed commission on economic cooperation on Tuesday.

The minister said that the designing of the second stage of a pipeline to carry Soviet natural gas to eastern Turkey is nearing completion. The Soviet Union may also help construct the Istanbul underground and modernise railways.

Speaking about prospects for cooperation, the minister noted that negotiations to open the second highway in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic will soon begin.

Turkish Trade Protocol Signed in Istanbul

LD1103130990 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 11 Mar 90

[Text] Istanbul March 11 TASS—A protocol of intentions to set up a Soviet-Turkish Chamber of Commerce and Industry, signed here, is intended to help firms and amalgamations establish bilateral economic ties, organise exhibitions and hold seminars for Soviet and Turkish businessmen.

It was signed by Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry Deputy Chairman N. Melnikov and Turkish Union of Commerce and Industry Chambers and Exchanges Chairman A. Coskun.

Investigation of Turkish Newsmen Confirmed

PM0103085390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under general heading "From Our Correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] ANATOLIA's correspondent reported from Moscow: Three Turkish correspondents have been detained in Baku, capital of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

Shevki Myutevellioglu [name as transliterated], staff member of the Turkish Embassy in Moscow, stated that the embassy had learned about the arrest of MILLIYET correspondents Rafet Balli [name as transliterated] and Mudzhakhit Byuber [name as transliterated] and GUNAYDIN correspondent Ifran Sapmaz [name as transliterated], but so far had not received any official information from the Soviet authorities. The Turkish journalists were detained at the moment when, having purchased tickets in advance, they took off in an aircraft en route from Baku to the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic].

IZVESTIYA's correspondent got in touch with the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration and asked for a comment on the ANATOLIA report.

"Indeed," a Foreign Ministry spokesman said, "three Turkish citizens were detained a few days ago in Baku, and it later transpired that they are journalists from two Turkish newspapers. They had illegally crossed into USSR territory from Iran. The circumstances of this case are presently under investigation."

Adamshin Receives Italian Ambassador Salleo

PM2802114590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 21 February A.L. Adamshin, USSR deputy foreign minister, received Italian Ambassador F. Salleo

at the latter's request. There was a discussion of several questions of bilateral Soviet-Italian relations.

Joint Venture With Austria Produces Magazine

LD2702223790 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 27 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 27 TASS—The VESTNIK magazine, a joint effort of diplomats, businessmen and journalists of the Soviet Union and Austria, will be a herald of glasnost in the international arena.

This well-illustrated and fact-packed monthly is an English-language edition of the popular VESTNIK of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

The Foreign Ministry press centre was the scene today of the launch of the magazine's first issue published in a circulation of 50,000.

The magazine's publication became possible thanks to cooperation between the Foreign Ministry and the Austrian firm Radd and Dressler-Verlagsges, said Vitaliy Milyaev, magazine editor-in-chief.

The magazine will be compiled in Moscow and printed in Austria by Vestnik corporation, a specially established joint venture.

The new magazine will be published, above all, for people interested in Soviet foreign policy and economy as well as in world problems.

VESTNIK is a digest of current foreign policy documents of the Soviet parliament, the government and the foreign office, reflecting Soviet approaches to various problems of world politics.

It is expected that diplomats, researchers, businessmen and journalists, whose work is connected with East-West relations, will be the monthly's main subscribers abroad.

VESTNIK consists of four main sections dealing with policy, economics, history and culture. Its first issue opens with a letter by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to readers.

Adamishin Holds Talks With Switzerland's Jacobi

LD0103111590 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 28 Feb 90

[Text] Berne March 1 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin, visiting Berne at the invitation of the Swiss Foreign Affairs Department, held talks on Wednesday with Klaus Jacobi, state secretary of the Foreign Affairs Department.

Adamishin was also received by Rene Felber, head of the Foreign Affairs Department.

The talks, which passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, focussed on Soviet-Swiss relations, urgent European and international issues and areas of possible cooperation between the USSR and Switzerland.

Much attention was paid to the development of the European process, the German question in the context of strengtening security and cooperation in Europe, and settling regional conflicts.

Senior executives of the department were informed about the draft platform "to humane, democratic socialism", approved by the plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee in February, 1990, political and economic transformations, and efforts to create a new Soviet federation.

Rogachev Meets, Holds Talks With British Aide

PM2802110590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 21 February I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, received P. Cradock, the British prime minister's special adviser on foreign policy, at the latter's request. During the talk, in which R. Braithwaite, British ambassador to the USSR, took part, there was an exchange of opinions on problems of the situation in the Asian and Pacific region.

EC Trade Agreement Endorsed in Brussels

LD0103060590 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 28 Feb 90

[Text] Brussels February 28 TASS—The Soviet Union and the European Community endorsed the agreement on trade, and commercial and economic cooperation that they signed last December. The notes to this effect were exchanged at the European Community's headquarters in Brussels today. Under the existing arrangement the agreement will go into effect as of April 1, 1990.

The agreement creates legal basis for the development of commercial and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the European Community which comprises 12 industrialised European countries.

The agreement, specifically, envisages the granting by the sides of the most favoured nation treatment to each other in trade and the establishment of cooperation in various areas—industry, standardisation, agriculture, power, including nuclear, banking and a number of other areas.

Finnish Parliamentary Delegation Visits Moscow

PM0703145590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] In Moscow 5 March J. Skinnari, heading a delegation of the Finnish Parliament's Commission on

Social Questions, expressed deep interest in the expansion of ties with the Soviet Union. The delegation is visitng the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions.

During the conversation USSR people's deputies informed the guests about the most acute social problems in our society and the activity aimed at resolving them.

Pugo Confers With Finnish Ambassador Talvitie

PM0703165390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Visit by Ambassador"]

[Text] B.K. Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, has received H. Talvitie, Finnish ambassador to the USSR, at his request.

The discussion, which was frank and businesslike in nature, discussed a number of aspects of Soviet-Finnish relations. At the ambassador's request B.K. Pugo talked about the present stage in the restructuring of the party and Soviet society.

The parties voiced a common opinion on the need for the further progressive development of Soviet-Finnish cooperation based on the accords achieved during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Finland last October.

Zagladin Comments on Finnish Friendship Treaty

LD2702131790 Helsinki International Service in English 0930 GMT 27 Feb 90

[Text] The Finnish-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance can be amended if developments in the relationship between the two countries call for that, says a high-ranking Soviet official. Vadim Zagladin, an adviser to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, said in a press interview published in Finland on Sunday that at the moment he sees no reason to amend the treaty, which has created many good things and served as a basis for good Finnish-Soviet relations. If any changes are made in the future, also the clause in the treaty concerning Germany can be reassessed. Mr. Zagladin did not want to advise Finland on matters pertaining to European integration and said it was up to Finland to decide whether it wants to pursue membership in the European Communities.

Sweden Commits to East Europe Development

PM1203145390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Zubko dispatch: "Sweden Renews Its Course"]

[Excerpt] Stockholm—"Historic changes have occurred in our part of the planet in recent months. Demands for freedom and democracy from the peoples of East European countries have made the former regimes give way." The government statement which Swedish Prime Minister I. Carlsson delivered in the Riksdag (parliament) begins with this sentence.

Over the next three years, he said, Sweden intends to allocate one billion kronor to the development of cooperation with East European states in the spheres of democracy, environmental protection, the economy, culture, and social affairs.

As in the past, the statement voices support for the traditional Swedish policy of neutrality, which is founded on "strong, all-around, and universal defense." It also states that the CSCE process is a very important all-European forum. At the same time all 35 states must have an opportunity to participate in talks on military questions. [passage omitted]

Soviet Trade Relations With West Examined

90UI0411A Moscow TRUD in Russian 2 Mar 90 p 3

[Interview with S.Ya. Maslov, USSR commercial representative in Great Britain, conducted by correspondent A. Burmistenko, in London; date not given: "Foreign Currency Does Not Grow on Trees"]

[Text] [Burmistenko] Stanislav Yakovlevich, it will soon be a year since our ministries, enterprises, and cooperatives acquired the right of direct outlet onto the foreign market. What is the view from here, London, of the present stage of the reorganization of the USSR's foreign economic complex? What are the problems?

[Maslov] The main advantage, in my view, is precisely that the manufacturers themselves have been afforded an opportunity to sell their products on the foreign market. The problem, however, is that as of the present the practical results of this reform are negligibly few compared with the expectations which we placed in the modernization of the foreign economic complex.

Everything in this seeming paradox is, in fact, very logical and natural: Although the right of outlet onto the foreign market has been granted, the country's industry is not ready to compete with Western products on world markets.

As a result, tallying the results of the activity of our exporters in 1989, we see that there have been no appreciable changes either in terms of the quantity of the structure of the commodities sold by us on the market. To speak specifically of Britain, the fuel and raw material group of commodities constitutes, as before, the lion's share of our exports here (on the order of 85 percent).

[Burmistenko] Thus the main condition of success on the foreign market is an improvement in production within the country?

[Maslov] Yes, an improvement in our economy and an enhancement of the competitiveness of the products we manufacture plus acquisition of the necessary professional know-how by the officials who today represent the interests of Soviet industry on the foreign market. Unfortunately, many of them do not possess this know-how as yet. It will take time for them to acquire professional skills and knowledge. It is necessary to learn elementary things, the standard of dealings with Western partners, for example: precise observance of contract commitments, timeliness of replies to correspondence, and an ability to keep one's word. These are the standards of business culture which exist in the world of business and which are essential for successful commerce.

[Burmistenko] Another fashionable and currently popular form of foreign trade activity is the creation of joint ventures. There is here also much desire and enthusiasm, and statements of intent are being signed, but only a small number make it to the point of actual production. What is the problem here?

[Maslov] The majority of our business executives have a somewhat simplistic understanding of the process of the creation of joint ventures. They believe that having signed the appropriate documents, Western investments for the development of production will be obtained immediately. In reality everything is far more complex.

As of today we have 65 joint ventures registered with the British, but only a negligible number of them, no more than a dozen, have actually started work. And as a rule, furthermore, it is mainly small joint ventures of a nonproduction nature which are created, chiefly in the sphere of service and a variety of brokerage activities; that is, not entirely what our economy primarily needs at this time.

The problems of the joint ventures reside in the specific conditions of our economy: lack of convertibility of the ruble, the difficulty of the repatriation of the profits of Western investors, the high degree of risk, from their viewpoint, attending invested capital and the corresponding rate of profit, and the frequent changes in Soviet legislation concerning joint ventures.

And the most important thing—tremendous difficulties arise in the material and technical supplies to such ventures. The planned, centralized nature of distribution in our economy does not provide for or take account of the possibilities of Western firms' participation in joint ventures. In addition, the pertinent legislative provisions say plainly that the joint ventures must be supplied in **extra-plan fashion** ; that is, they must somehow themselves find the necessary material somewhere. But where and how are a virtually insoluble problem. Either the enterprises must purchase such material overseas—again with foreign currency. Or they must purchase them from our export stocks via foreign trade organizations, which is extremely improbable inasmuch as no one would want to disrupt supplies of these commodities.

[Burmistenko] In other words, the supply system, as it now exists within the country, is not adapted to responding rapidly and flexibly to the proposals of the foreign market?

[Maslov] Absolutely right. Joint ventures deal with the market economy in the full meaning of the words. We do not have such. We have set the task of the creation of a socialist market, but this is a thing of the future. Meanwhile the work of certain of our enterprises operating under free enterprise conditions is meshing with great difficulty with the centralized planned economy.

[Burmistenko] You have mentioned that British businessmen consider capital investments in the USSR a big risk for themselves. Why?

[Maslov] A whole number of factors, which we are currently encountering everywhere, plays a part here. Even in concluding quite a simple deal connected with a contract of sale, British suppliers are now demanding some special payment assurances, which was not the case before.

Psychologically this is easy to explain. For decades they dealt with Soviet foreign trade associations, which they knew well. But now a multitude of Soviet trading organizations of new people entirely unknown in the West is moving onto the market. And the businessmen are naturally voicing doubts: What kind of plant is this, what kind of cooperative is this, is it capable of paying for or returning the money invested, will it not go bankrupt tomorrow or the day after?

[Burmistenko] And what kind of assurances do Western businessmen wish to obtain?

[Maslov] They are demanding confirmation from the USSR Foreign Economic Bank that a given organization is solvent and that it may be trusted and that in the event of its dissolution or insolvency, the Foreign Economic Bank must guarantee that they obtain the resources which they have already invested or ensure payment for equipment which has been supplied.

[Burmistenko] And how might we strengthen their trust in the new Soviet partners?

[Maslov] A very major shortcoming preventing us today from developing trade and economic relations not only with Great Britain, but with other countries as well is the almost complete lack of information about our new participants in foreign economic activity. Whereas in London it is easy for a small charge to obtain information on the basic indicators of any British firm, its solvency, and its overall financial position, simply no one gives out such information in the USSR. But business is not done this way.

[Burmistenko] Who, in your view, should deal with the preparation of such information in the Soviet Union?

[Maslov] In the West it is usually given out by the commercial banks or chambers of commerce. Obviously, we also need to create the same system—data banks on the economic indicators and financial position of Soviet enterprises and cooperatives, under the auspices of the USSR Chamber of Commerce, say.

[Burmistenko] Let us assume I am the director of an actual plant in Leningrad, say, or the chairman of a cooperative, let us assume, in Voronezh. What advice could you give me as to how practically I should operate, to whom I should apply, and how I should start trading in my products on the foreign market?

[Maslov] It is necessary first of all to link up with a commercial office overseas, if only here, in London, say, and tell it what and in what volume the enterprise is prepared to supply and on what terms. And if this product creates interest on the market, we might recommend a way of selling it, either via one of our joint-stock companies or via a British firm.

There are examples of such. Specifically, very active purposeful work on the foreign market is being performed by the Orel "Prompribor" enterprise, whose representatives, led by the director, have visited Britain several times already. We organized a presentation for them here and chose an agent firm. They signed an agreement and are now starting to come onto the British market with their products.

[Burmistenko] And how may you be contacted?

[Maslov] Either by calling me directly at the commercial office in London on 340-19-07 (telex 28577, FAX 01-348-01-12) or by writing to the USSR Commercial Office in Great Britain, London.

Latin America & Caribbean

Komplektov Talks with Nicaraguan Envoy

LD0703115390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1110 GMT 7 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 March. (TASS)—The situation in and around Nicaragua in the light of the general elections held recently in that country was discussed in a friendly atmosphere today by Viktor Komplektov, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Ernesto Castillo, ambassador of Nicaragua to the Soviet Union. Certain matters of bilateral Soviet-Nicaraguan relations were also touched on. The Soviet diplomat received the ambassador of Nicaragua at the latter's request.

Nicaragua Prepares For New Government April 25

Sandinistas Remain Politically Powerful

90UI0405A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 28 Feb 90 p 3

[Article by M. Nepesov, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA international observer: "When the Predictions Don't Come True"]

[Text] We have become accustomed, or have been trained, to interpret events taking place in far-away countries within an entirely rigid schematic. If all of a sudden the "wrong" candidate comes to power as a result of elections in a friendly state, we all feel disappointment and varying apprehension with regard to how the new leadership of one country or another is going to relate to us.

In the meantime, today's world is so multi-faceted and mobile that at times even the most experienced political experts are simply unable to predict the development of the international environment as a whole, let alone that of individual states. So here on Saturday, the day before general elections in Nicaragua, judging from the surveys of Western information agencies, one should have expected the undisputed victory of Sandinista Front leader Daniel Ortega. The ratio of those intending to vote for him and S. Ramirez to those proposing to cast their ballots for National Opposition Union candidates Violeta Barrios de Chamorro and V. Godoy was 51 to 24.

What did we learn on 26 February? According to data from Nicaragua's highest election board, based on a tally of 79 percent of the votes, 55.2 percent went to Chamorro and 48.8 percent to D. Ortega. The opposition alliance then went ahead of the Sandinistas by 13 percentage points. In the view of observers from the United Nations and the Organization of American States, as well as several hundred representatives of various parliamentary delegations, including a group headed by former U.S. President J. Carter, the elections proceeded in an entirely orderly fashion, unaccompanied by any violence.

Beginning in the early morning, long lines formed outside the voting booths in the cities and villages of Nicaragua. D. Ortega was one of the first to cast his vote. Like everyone else he dipped a finger in indelible ink, to preclude the possibility of repeat voting. V. Chamorro did the same. On the eve of the elections she visited the grave of her husband, slain by executioners of the dictator Somoza. Ortega was absolutely confident of victory. "We will be victorious in the elections. We are here for the people to decide who they will elect. And we will respect the choice of the people. But I am convinced the people will vote for me."

On the very next day, however, the Nicaraguan president was forced to acknowledge that opposition candidate Chamorro was overtaking him according to results of the vote tally. It is a very sad thing, of course, when one is not elected. Apparently, the Nicaraguans were tired of more than 10 years of instability and an environment amounting essentially to an emergency situation. As a result of never-ending armed conflict with the contras, the peasants did not have the opportunity to labor peacefully on the land. At the same time, however, who would dare refute the great historical contribution of the Sandinistas to the development of their native land? They toppled one of the most brutal rulers, General Somoza, who enjoyed the complete favor of Washington. Then in the face of incessant armed attacks by the contras, who were supported by money and weapons from the United States, the Sandinista Front resisted an

economic blockade and laid the foundations for the independent development of Nicaragua. Ortega and his comrades-in-arms forced their powerful northern neighbor to reckon with their country.

Without a doubt, the Sandinistas remain as before one of the predominant political forces in this Central American country. It is no accident that a number of former opposition leaders declared publicly that "Sandinista Front representatives will be able to enter into a new coalition government of the republic." Violeta Chamorro stated, "There were neither victors nor vanquished as a result of the general elections. The Nicaraguan people have voted for a democratic republic and expressed their desire to live in peace, freedom, and democracy."

Ortega Demands Contra Disbandment

LD0903212390 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 9 Mar 90

[Text] Managua March 9 TASS—President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua has demanded the disarmament and disbandment of the contras before the transfer of power to the new government on April 25.

"If we want all Nicaraguans to be calm, the contras should be disbanded and the counterrevolution be done away with," he told a meeting in Managua to celebrate International Women's Day on Thursday.

Ortega emphasised the need to preserve the Sandinista People's Army and the Interior Ministry, which, he said, ensure the security of all Nicaraguans. He described the present calm in Nicaragua as the calm before the storm.

"We are duty bound to prevent the whirlwind of a civil war, popular revolt and violence to lash at us. We need to act realistically and constructively to see to it that normal conditions be created by the time the new government takes office."

The contras, who continue their actions with the backing of the Honduran Army and the U.S. Government, need to be disarmed and disbanded. Ortega stresses that if this did not happen, he would be unable to guarantee calm on April 25.

"We should agree that a new government will be formed in the country. But this does not mean that it will be able to do everything it wishes without our consent. We will give it an opportunity to do away with the contras. But if they are not demobilised by the moment of the handover of power, the situation in the country will be very serious, because the whole people will arm in order to defend themselves and do away with the counterrevolution," Ortega stressed.

Ortega Addresses Nation

LD1103180290 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 11 Mar 90

[Text] Managua March 11 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov:

President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua has stated that he "fully supports the efforts of the future new government to obtain foreign economic aid" for the purpose of getting the republic out of the economic crisis. In his address to the nation, which he made on Saturday, before leaving for Chile and Brazil to attend inauguration ceremonies in those countries, Ortega said: "I shall do my best to induce various countries to render economic assistance to Nicaragua."

He pointed out that "all Nicaraguans should pool their efforts, because this is the only way to achieve economic and social stability." He stressed that the Sandinista National Liberation Front would assume a constructive stand after the turning over of power to the new government on April 25 and would help it restore the national economy.

Ortega expressed hope that the United States would render economic assistance to Nicaragua. At the same time, he pointed out that no matter how extensive the U.S. aid might be, it would not compensate for the economic damage amounting to 16 billion dollars, which was inflicted on Nicaragua as a result of the U.S. aggression. He said that the republic would press for the compensation for losses by the White House through the International Court of Justice. Ortega demanded that the U.S. lift economic embargo against Nicaragua, which should have access to the system of international credits together with other countries.

The Nicaraguan president pointed to the need for the immediate demobilisation of counterrevolutionary units and demanded that the U.S. stop helping "the Nicaraguan resistance forces." He said that the money, allocated earlier by the U.S. Congress for financing the contras, should be transferred to the U.N. and the Organisation of American States that will monitor their demobilisation.

"I shall spare no efforts to make the turning over of power to the new government on april 25 a normal and peaceful event. It will strengthen democracy in Nicaragua," he said.

Bayardo Arce, member of the national leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, announced its decision to start on Saturday a massive enrollment in the Sandinista Front. "The Sandinista National Liberation Front is open to all who want to be in the vanguard, to become a true opposition party rallying the best representatives of Nicaraguan society," he pointed out.

Bayardo Arce said that he had visited Cuba and had asked Fidel Castro to continue, as far as possible, to render assistance to Nicaragua. He expressed hope that Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, president-elect of Nicaragua, would not reject Cuban cooperation in medicine and other spheres. "It depends on Violeta Barrios de Chamorro whether the Nicaraguan people will be deprived of Cuban aid or not," Bayardo Arce stressed.

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev Opens Congress 12 March

LD1203123490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0711 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Opening speech by M.S. Gorbachev at Third Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow—live]

[Excerpts] Good morning, comrade deputies. Of the 2,245 people's deputies of the USSR, 2,092 delgates are present, according to the registration at the tables, at the extraordinary third congress of people's deputies. [passage omitted: checking of registration]

I note that the presence in the hall of 2,087 allows us, in accordance with Article 7 of the congress rules, to begin our work.

The extraordinary Third Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR is declared open. [passage omitted: as the chairman of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Moldavia is in Brazil, the Moldavian group is led by Ivan Konstantinovich Cheban]

There is no representative of the Lithuanian SSR in the presidium. A session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic is in progress there. It opened yesterday and is continuing its work today. In fact, it began the day before yesterday, at night. The information that is coming in from there is rather disturbing. So far, we do not have the official documents or the decisions which that session has already adopted or will yet adopt. At all events, the information that we are receiving shows that the decisions which are being taken there affect the fundamental interests and destiny of the republic, the people, and our entire state.

It seems to us therefore that we could not give instructions of a practical kind for the time being, insofar as we lack exhaustive information, to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and primarily to the chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities, to the commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet and to the Soviet Government, to begin a study of the situation which is emerging in connection with the decisions which are being taken by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR, and to make the necssary assessment of them and draw the conclusions which follow from this.

If you have no objections, we could consider that we have agreed that work should, as it were, begin. Well, comrades? Do we need to vote? Or are we agreed? [murmur of assent from hall] We're agreed. Good. [passage omitted on operation of electronic voting system, formation of congress secretariat]

Let us move on, comrades, to an examination of the agenda of the congress. Allow me to say something briefly about the proposals on this question which have formed the basis of the proposals which you have in front of you. The USSR Supreme Soviet, having made the decision to convene an extraordinary third congress of USSR People's Deputies, submitted for its consideration a draft law to establish the post of president of the USSR and introduce appropriate changes and addenda to the USSR Constitution. The Supreme Soviet has also submitted a draft law to change and supplement the USSR constitution in connection with the adoption of the foundations of legislation on land and of the law on ownership. The Central Committee of the CPSU yesterday decided to submit as a legislative initiative for consideration by the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR a draft law on changes and additions to the USSR constitution on questions of the political system: Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution.

It was on the basis of this that the agenda was formed and it is proposed to include it for consideration by the extraordinary congress in the following formulation: On the introduction of changes and additions to the USSR Constitution—Basic Law—and the establishment of the post of president of the USSR. That covers all the issues on the basis of which the decision to hold the extraordinary congress was taken.

In submitting for consideration by the congress the question of establishing the post of president, we ought evidently to provide in the agenda for the election of the president of the USSR, on condition that a decision is taken on the first question. Bearing in mind that the Third Congress is an extraordinary congress and has been convened to examine the issues mentioned, it would be undesirable to include in its agenda other matters, however important. For the format of the extraordinary congress is perfectly clear: it determines—is determined by—a particular situation and the problems that it has got to discuss and take decisions on.

Well, and then finally we need to examine the powers of the newly elected people's deputies of the USSR. Evidently this question also arouses no objections, comrades. I have given this information by way of a brief comment on the basis on which the agenda before you is being proposed.

There are three questions, then: the question of recognition of the powers of the deputies; on changes and additions to the USSR constitution and establishment of the post of president; and the election of the president. [passage omitted: deputies vote not to discuss agenda]

[Unidentified deputy from floor] I should very much like to make this request: that we should vote on the points of the agenda one at a time, because Point 3 in effect deprives us of the possibility of choice: we've got to vote for a president, though this is surely the prerogative of the people. And so we need to vote on Point 3 separately. The first two can probably be combined.

[Gorbachev] On the whole I don't think there's any great legal difficulty here. However the main issue is decided, and whatever changes and additions are adopted, that is also how the question of election will be decided, comrades. It may not even arise, if we make a negative decision. So then it wouldn't be necessary to include it at

all. It's clear that there's a link, a very direct link, and there's no problem. I don't think it's Point 3 that determines the essence of the matter, but rather the point from which all else follows. So there's no danger here, and we won't fall into any trap. [passage omitted: agenda is adopted]

The decision is adopted. The congress agenda is ratified. Now on the order of work. Allow me to report in somewhat more detail on this question. It is proposed that the work of the congress should take three days. Today it will be possible to study the question of the recognition of newly-elected deputies, then listen to a report on the issue of introducing amendments and additions to the USSR constitution and instituting the post of USSR president, and start discussion on it.

It is envisaged that by the end of today the congress should be able to adopt a decision on this issue. Given a positive decision on the second point of the agenda, tomorrow could be devoted to putting forward and discussing candidates and holding elections for the USSR president. At the morning sitting of the third day of the congress, 14 March, it will be possible to listen to the report of the tellers' commission on the results of the secret ballot for the election of the USSR president and to adopt a suitable decision.

It is natural that all these proposals are based on the draft, on those proposals which are carried in the draft and which are published. But, if any amendments are made, the congress will also amend the agenda. This is natural. You understand, don't you, comrades? [passage omitted: Gorbachev hands over to Gidaspov, chairman of the Credentials Commission, followed by Lukyanov]

Moscow TV Carries Congress of People's Deputies

Voting for President Discussed

LD1203194990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1803 GMT on 12 March begins carrying a recording of the Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 12 March, continuing after the interval.

At 1806 GMT Gorbachev says that by midday 198 deputies had put their names down to vote. He lists those who are to speak in the next session.

At 1807 GMT Deputy Dmitriyev takes the floor and makes a couple of proposals on the voting procedure for electing a president.

At 1809 GMT an unnamed deputy from Moscow supports Dmitriyev's view that there should not be a debate on this issue but it should be decided by vote.

At 1811 GMT Gorbachev doesn't agree and believes that we should stick to the agenda. He wants to put to the vote whether Dmitriyev's proposal should be adopted. But first he asks if any other deputies want to express their view on this point. Belozertsev from Karelia supports Dmitriyev's proposal. The proposal is then put to the vote.

At 1816 GMT Dmitriyev's proposal is defeated by 1,538 votes to 374; with 47 abstentions.

At 1821 GMT Gorbachev says we shall now pass on to the debates. He passes the floor to Alekseyev from the Constitutional Supervision Commission. Alekseyev says he is a specialist who has devoted himself professionally to the matters under discussion. The political structure in the country has lost its effectiveness, he says. We have been standing still. He admits that serious blunders have been made in the scientific field. We have become prisoners of the slogan: All power to the soviets. A purely parliamentary structure is leading the country up a blind alley. We have a very primitive idea of the expression distribution of power. Organized, structured state power can only assume real force where legislative, executive and judicial power are balanced. He believes that a multiparty system can only lead to a collapse of the social system.

At 1830 GMT Alekseyev says he doesn't want to delay bringing in a new Constitution which truly protects people's rights.

At 1831 GMT Deputy Utkin takes the floor. He says the present situation requires much thought and responsibility. During perestroyka we have got rid of many things which are holding up progress, but this process needs to be speeded up. He criticizes scientists and technologists for failing to introduce new achievements. He also expresses concern over the slowness in conversion, and in the production of consumer goods such as soap and television sets. He compares wind power development in the USSR with that in other countries and says that we realize that without scientific-technical progress the country cannot hope to advance. He supports reductions in strategic armaments.

At 1840 GMT Gorbachev reads out Article 27 about the need to observe decorum during debates, with a warning that microphones can be switched off if necessary. He passes the floor to Nazarbayev, chairman of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet.

At 1842 GMT Nazarbayev takes the floor. He speaks on the Presidency and of Vice Presidency. He regards the Presidency as a pledge of the unity of the republics. They see themselves within the framework of the Soviet state but he says that presidential power should acquire a different character from that envisaged so far. He talks of the advantages to be had from presidential power. The law on land has clauses which are unacceptable for Kazakhstan, he says, with reference to the specific features of land ownership there. The central departments wish to conceal their own, vested interests here. Ownership prerogatives do entail certain rights to embark on foreign economic activity. He says that the government must, at long last, decide, whom it wishes to serve:

Departmental interests, or those of the people. Nazarbayev continues, stating that the Republican Supreme Soviet has recently declared that it reserves the right to make sure that the soviets become real owners of land and resources. This was done in view of the sluggish pace of the government's work in this area. We very much hope that the first action of the president will aim to strengthen our Union federation.

Presidency 'No Simple Matter'

LD1203200190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recording of the Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 12 March.

At 1853 GMT (Sofiulin) complains that the regulations are frequently contradictory. In this context, the establishment of the post of president with all that it entails, for instance amendments to the Constitution, is no simple matter. This is taking place against a backdrop of growing shortages and the ever-worsening situation in the shops. Lines are growing longer, speculation is growing worse. The speaker lists all sorts of goods which are simply unavailable. But this is also the case in Moscow. Invalids and war veterans must be provided for in the first instance. The situation is a result of economic instability and the diktat of individual regions. What is needed is large-scale and decisive action: This is why we support the establishment of presidential rule. This post is now essential. The president must have support deputies.

At 1901 GMT Afanasyev says we are tackling a very complex issue: It concerns the structure of state power in the USSR. It is a question of our political system. We are tackling this issue in a grave atmosphere—there have already been casualties in the USSR. Does perestroyka, the USSR's citizens and the initiator of perestroyka himself really need this post of president? The interregional group of deputies has made its views on this score known. There was an open letter to Gorbachev, among other things.

Afanasyev states: "We feel negatively about the introduction of this post at the Congress of the People's Deputies."

He continues: "While accepting in principle the presidential form of government, but not considering this question indisputable—it should be discussed even in its principal sense—we consider that a hasty attempt to introduce the presidency at the Congress is a gross and very grave political mistake." Expanding on this theme he says: "If our leader [vozhd] and the founder created the foundations of something, it is the elevation of the state policy of mass coercion and terror into a principle. And besides [noise in the audience, a voice shouts: "one minute left"], he elevated lawlessness into a principle of state policy. This was carried through the whole Stalinist period when, in a drunken stupor, our national wealth was squandered, wholesale and retail. And it is proposed that the same thing is to be continued according to tradition. And so—I have not exhausted my statutory time yet...

"[Gorbachev, interrupting] That is all, you have exausted it. [Gorbachev rings the bell]

"[Afanasyev] I should like to ask for one minute. One minute and I will finish.

"[Gorbachev] There, look at the zeroes. [minutes on the display] Comrades, shall we give him one minute? [noise in the audience] No, No, that is all, thank you."

Speakers on Presidency

LD1203203890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recording of the Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow in 12 March.

At 1911 GMT Dementey begins to speak. The social and political situation is becoming worse because of disdain for the law. This has an effect on good work from the labor collectives. The speaker emphasizes the point that laws are ill-observed and ill-respected. The legislative and executive authorities must cooperate more closely. But the executive authorities are ill-equipped with powers to deal effectively with situation as they arise. This is why we are debating this issue of establishing the post of president—he may put an end to the anarchy, crime and permissiveness. We need strong rule, to make sure that laws are observed, to make sure that services work in accordance with the laws. The executive power in its present form is incapable of action as effective as that of president. How will our socialist federation change? Will the proposed Soviet of the Federation be able to improve ethnic policies? The national economy complex needs proper guidance and authority from the center—but republics need self-reliance and more autonomy. These issues must be tackled. The speaker complains that not enough has been done to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station accident—no program has even been passed yet. So, once we have a president all these issues, he hopes, will be tackled in a more efficient and effective manner. Let us pass the law on establishing the post of president of the USSR.

At 1919 GMT Yeliseyev recalls that the First and Second congresses already debated this issue, in the lobbies—most people want it, most favor establishing the post of president. Now that we have proposals to change the wording of Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution, no one can accuse us of wanting to strengthen dictatorial powers by introducing this post. This Congress will not be able to see, or debate, all the finer points of this issue. The speaker proposes that the appropriate law should be passed and worked on further, taking various proposals voiced since into consideration. The president, he hopes, will be guided by Supreme Soviet and Congress decisions and not by Politburo decisions, and he hopes that the

presidential candidates—Yeliseyev corrects himself to say candidate—will be able to give assurances of this kind.

Yeliseyev thinks that presidential recommendations on who should have the post of foreign minister, defense minister and KGB chairman ought to be submitted to the Supreme Soviet, and proposes various procedural amendments to the draft law. He is in favor of establishing the Soviet Federation, grouping those who are in charge not of legislative, but of executive power—why duplicate the work of other legislative bodies? But there is no need to establish the Presidential Council. A president cannot be a deputy, says the speaker. He cannot have any other paid jobs. His prerogatives are subject to Supreme Soviet rules.

At 1929 GMT Vorotnikov says that the more rights and liberties people have, the stronger should the state be. But we do not have this. Disintegration is worsening, discipline is declining, crime is growing. The sovereign rights of republics fail to be appropriately protected. All this needs strong presidential rule. The party is now revising, reviewing the forms of its participation in the life of the state, and that is why we can talk about establishing this post. One can say that the establishment of the post of president is a result of greater freedom. He says that he thinks that we already have opposition, deemed "necessary" by Afanasyev. If he wants to leave the Party and set up his own opposition he is free so to do—that is why there are proposals to change the wording of Articles 6 and 7. The situation in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] is complicated. The republic needs political consolidation—the introduction of the post of president will be of benefit here. The president must have the necessary powers to be able to get on with the job for real.

At 1939 GMT Gorbachev says that an editorial commission must be set up before the interval is announced. A draft decision on this is put to the vote: 1845 for; 50 against; 29 abstentions. Announcements are made prior the interval. An interval is announced till 1600 Moscow time.

'Urgency' in Selecting President

LD1203205790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recording of the Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 12 March.

At 1944 GMT Gorbachev opens the next session.

At 1947 GMT 1845 deputies are registered as present. Gorbachev says that the absence of the drafting commission accounts for the smaller numbers.

At 1949 GMT Gumbaridze takes the floor, continuing the discussions. Perestroyka has opened up new opportunities for the union republics to acquire real authority in their territory. But each republic ought to have the right to elect their own presidents. There are cases when presidential power can run counter to the sovereignty of the republics. He proposes certain amendments to protect this sovereignty. The introduction of a presidency should lead to new treaty relations between Georgia and the center.

At 1956 GMT Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol takes the floor. The post of president is dictated by the logic of the reforms. He agrees that there is a paralysis of power, as Alekseyev said. He favors a nationwide election of the president, but favors the election of the president by the Congress on this occasion. He raises the possibility of subsequent elections without quotas for public organizations. Finally, he stresses that the president must be dedicated to the process of reform in the country. There can be no delay. We have the possiblity of improving the situation, and we have to take it.

At 2002 GMT Deputy Dorokhov takes the floor, asking will we be able to channel popular energy into creative areas, or will they take a destructive road? He warns of the dangers of extremist tendencies. We have to save not only perestroyka, but the whole country. He notes various negative tendencies in the country that are making life unsafe for Soviet people and says that people are in favor of strong protection from crime. He pays tribute to strong power abroad. Dorokhov favors a nationwide election of a president. He casts doubt on the work of the Supreme Soviet, pointing to the poor level of behavior of deputies, and comparing it to a jungle, not a parliament. Gorbachev intervenes, and Dorokhov continues, expressing concern that the party may lose Gorbachev as its leader if be becomes president. He points to the urgency of the situation in introducing the presidency: Enough talking—let's work.

At 2012 GMT Shmelev takes the floor, supporting the presidency. We have to fill the power vacuum in interethnic relations. He goes on to note the importance of changing government psychology in such matters as the new law on taxation. It is time to end the system of double prices in the agricultural sector. He also disagrees with the duplicitous attitude of the government toward the cooperatives, noting the great contribution made by the cooperatives in recent years. He then criticizes Article 6 in the recent law on ownership, concerning private property, and notes also the need for pricing reform, and other unpopular measures. There is also a need for external sources of finance. He is convinced that the new president will embark on these measures.

At 2023 GMT Ibragimov, from the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, takes the floor. He points to the various negative tendencies in the life of the country, noting the need not to stand aside while such tendencies threaten the country. He believes the presidency to be both essential and timely. It is an important step in reestablishing authority in the country, able to consolidate social forces. But certain parts of the draft law need

extra work. It is not a panacea, however—we all need to work. However hard our past might be, we can only solve our problems together.

Many Support Presidency

LD1203221690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recording of the Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 12 March.

At 2032 GMT Batyshev takes the floor, supporting the establishment of the presidency. The Supreme Soviet is not capable of dealing with the problems that have arisen today. There has to be a proper division of spheres between the Congress, President and Supreme Soviet. He asks why we need a Soviet of the Federation if we have a Soviet of Nationalities. The question of where executive power lies has to be made precise. He points to some of the difficulties in the proposed voting procedures for the president. The mechanism of presidential power also has to be sorted out. There is also the matter of presidents in the union republics. Won't we have too many presidents? He believes the president should not hold party posts. He outlines the difficulties the country faces, asking how are we to fight crime? We need a strong democratic power. There can be no further delay.

At 2041 GMT Deputy Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee takes the floor. Everyone understands the historic significance of the decision we are taking. He agrees that the introduction of a presidency is desirable in the current difficult situation, but the main point lies deeper. He goes on to assert that the CPSU will continue to act like any other political party, in striving to lead the country. He concludes by pointing to the unjustness of those who constantly criticize the CPSU leadership for everything they do. Let's take this historic step. At 2053 GMT Deputy Goldanskiy takes the floor, supporting the Presidency on behalf of a group of deputies from the Academy of Sciences. He regrets that Afanasyev did not have the opportunity to finish his point. We are talking about the need for urgent reanimation, not long-term treatment. He notes the importance of the transfer of power from the party to the Presidency, and that Gorbachev should hold the post. He criticizes the present system in which a closed Politburo takes confidential decisions, such as the decision to send troops to Tbilisi last April. He proposes various amendments to the draft, concerning the appointment of officials, and voting procedures for the presidency.

At 2103 GMT Deputy Salayev takes the floor. He notes the need for various elaborations to the text of the draft, referring to specific clauses in the draft, including those concerning the introduction of a state of emergency, powers to dissolve parliament, and the committee for constitutional supervision. There must be specific limits to power in our country.

At 2114 GMT Gorbachev announces a 20-minute break.

Presidential Power Discussed

LD1203223290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recording of the Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 12 March.

At 2115 GMT the session continues. An explanation is given of the electronic voting system.

At 2119 GMT Gorbachev asks deputies to register. There are 1,963 deputies present. Work continues.

At 2121 GMT Deputy Kazannik takes the floor. He says that we do not know who took the decision to introduce troops into Afghanistan or to use force in Tbilisi, or who held up the evacuation of the population after the Chernobyl accident. Now we are faced with the problem of refugees and there is no specific person to deal with this. That is why he supports the introduction of the post of president of the USSR. However, there are caveats. There is a need for a system of counterbalance and restraint. Various articles are quoted and Kazannik proposes his solutions. He touches in particular upon the presidential power to call a general mobilization of the population, and proposes an amendment to the relevant article. He says that the institution of the post of president is inadmissable in the conditions of the federation of union republics. He says that the system of state bodies should be simplified with the institution of the post of president, for such a system will function better the simpler it is. If there is a president, the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet will have to be renounced, Kazannik says. He proposes other amendments to the articles on the Presidency.

At 2133 GMT Gorbachev says it is time to take advice as to our further action. According to the agenda we are to discuss and adopt the law on changes and amendments to the constitution. Some deputies say we should vote now while others propose that the debates be continued until noon tomorrow.

Representatives of the republics have not had a chance to speak yet, so they should be given a chance to speak. Or should be continue work today? No, that is obvious that we should not. So two proposals are put up for voting—to end debates, and to examine the documents after the republics have had a chance to say their piece.

At 2137 an unidentified deputy speaks. He says that young people should be given a chance to speak, not just those who are in their late fifties. Mironenko does not represent all young people in the country.

At 2138 GMT this unidentified deputy says that the question is of such a serious nature that the debate should be continued.

At 2139 GMT an unidentified military deputy gives his view.

At 2139 GMT Gorbachev asks for deputies to vote on the proposal to end the debates after the republics have

had a chance to speak: 1,119 deputies vote for; 839 against; 36 abstain. The voting total is 1994.

At 2143 GMT the decision has not been adopted, Gorbachev says, because there was a shortfall of four people.

At 2144 GMT the second proposal is put up for voting—to continue the debates tomorrow until noon. He asks the deputies to vote on that proposal: 1110 deputies vote for; 841 against; 42 abstain. The voting total is 1993. The decision is not adopted.

At 2148 GMT Gorbachev says that just one proposal remains to be voted on.

At 2149 GMT an unidentified deputy says the republics must be given a chance to speak, otherwise why did they bother coming here?

At 2150 GMT Palm says it's not clear what to do then if we go by the voting results. He says that revoting is needed.

At 2150 GMT a representative of the Soyuz group says his group should be given the opportunity to speak. Another unidentified deputy makes a proposal on giving the republics the floor. Gorbachev says various solutions are possible. He proposes that the debates be ended and the work of the commission be examined: 463 deputies vote for; 1464 against; 41 abstain. He says the working day will end soon. We will meet again tomorrow to decide what has to be done.

At 2157 GMT Deputy Podolyanina takes the floor. She says that the crisis situation in the country demands that radical decisions are taken. She recaps on the situation in the countryside. The bell rings and Gorbachev intervenes, saying that this is the only woman to speak, so pay attention to her. She asks the deputies to put the state in order. She says collective farmers should decide their fate by themselves. She says the collective farms have to be taken into account today. Agricultural output has risen under perestroyka. Practically nothing has been done to improve the lot of the countryside since the First Congress, she complains. She calls for justice for agricultural workers and points out shortcomings in the life of the countryside, namely the poor supply of the countyside with gas. Agricultural workers link the most positive changes in the countryside with the post of presidency. That is why agricultural workers support the post of president.

At 2207 GMT Gorbachev reads out some requests.

At 2207 GMT an unidentified deputy reads out various announcements: The interregional group will meet in the hall today after the congress; there is a sitting of the historic monument group and the ecology group tomorrow.

At 2208 GMT Gorbachev says we will close now. Tomorrow we will continue here at 1000 [0700 GMT]

Speakers Address Third Congress 12 March

Lukyanov on Constitution

PM1303101190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Second Edition pp 1 2

[Speech by A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at Third Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow: "On Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law) and the Institution of the Post of USSR President"]

[Text] Comrade deputies, the fundamental issues of further advancing political and economic reform, strengthening the system of governing the affairs of the state, and deepening socialist democracy are being submitted for examination by the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The solving of these issues by the congress will mean that changes of fundamental importance will start gaining strength in the development of the Soviet constitutional system and the coming-into-being of a socialist law-based state. What has necessitated such an urgent address to the congress—the need for stepping up the democratic reform that has been started in the country or some time-serving considerations, a desire to respond to the problems that are facing us or a striving for somehow aligning ourselves on the standards of generally accepted world practice, the logic of perestroyka itself, or the complexity of the situation in which the country finds itself today?

One would like to give the following answer: All these points could not fail to be taken into account by the Supreme Soviet and the country's leadership but it was the objective course itself of society's development that has, most of all, led us up to the changes that are being mapped out. It is governed, first of all, by the internal nature of the processes of renewal, and the experience, if not extensive yet, of the functioning of our new political institutions which has been accumulated. Indeed, it is precisely the course of reform that has confronted us with the need to radically enhance the role of the Soviets as sovereign organs of the people and, in relation with that, to change the functions and methods of the activity of the CPSU and its place in the political system of society. It is precisely the course of reform that has led us to the conclusion that all the variety of forms of ownership should be reflected in the constitution and legislation more fully and clearly and equal conditions for their development, support, and protection should be ensured. It is precisely the course of reform, the ambiguous processes faced by society when the changes that had been started went deep down, including faults in implementing the large-scale measures mapped out by the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, that have confronted us with the need to strengthen the mechanism of executing laws and other state decisions by establishing the post of president of the country. Thus, it is a question of the need to speed up perestroyka processes in political, socioeconomic, interethnic, and other relations.

The question is that there is an urgent need for a more precise definition of the structure and functions of the supreme bodies of state power. Ultimately the question is how effectively we will be able to provide for the continuation of the course for the renewal of all aspects of the social organism and for the creation of a humane and truly democratic society.

The implementation of the first stage of the political reform has radically changed the whole atmosphere of our life. The USSR People's Deputies Congress and the Supreme Soviet are working and have already done much for the creation of the legal basis for perestroyka. At the elections to the republican and local Soviets that are taking place now the process of formation of the system of state power bodies which are subject to renewal is being completed. Considerable transformation of the Soviet federation is being planned. It is being given a new content. Dozens of new public organizations and movements have been created in the country. Political activity of working people has grown sharply. This is a positive result of perestroyka, democratization, glasnost, and the formation of the law-governed state system.

At the same time growing anxiety of Soviet people has been observed of late in connection with the aggravation of the social and economic situation, the low success rate and even slowing down of the planned reforms, sharp conflicts on the interethnic basis, mass unrest and growth in crime. The demand for taking decisive measures direct at ensuring proper state and public order, citizens' safety, the normalization of the situation in the economy and the solution of the pressing social, ecological, and other problems is growing ever louder. The deep causes of the situation that has come about are directly linked with the nature of the historical moment we are living through: When the former command-administrative practices and political structures corresponding to them are being dismantled, while new ones, that would meet the needs of the period, are still only forming. The resistance to them, quite frankly, is still proving to be considerable. There is nothing unexpected in that. It is not merely a matter of difficulties of a transition period. The point primarily is that in the course of dozens of years all the real power in the country—political, economic, and spiritual—concentrated in the hands of the party and its committees at all levels.

Such a position of the CPSU was implanted into the political structures, the mentality of the leaders and the apparatus at all levels and the public consciousness. A departure from these notions, habits, and traditions requires both time and great effort and new cadres. This is understandable.

But all institutions, laws and procedures, which in the aggregate will constitute the core of a law-based state, can hardly be set up over a short period. This is a lengthy process, demanding not only intense legislative work, but also the development of society's political culture. This is especially necessary since legal nihilism, neglect of the rights of the individual, and distrust of authority have become deeply rooted. To a significant degree, it is precisely because of this that outbursts of extremism and national fanaticism, the susceptibility of whole social groups to primitive manipulation, instances of anarchy, uncivilized and violent forms of social behavior, and other conflicts originate. It is precisely here that one can find the source of destabilizing, explosive processes, and the stresses which burden the people's life and psyche.

All of this requires the reliable, steady, and capable administration of society. Those proposals which I have been instructed to report to the extraordinary congress of USSR People's Deputies have been dictated by the necessity for an immediate resolution of these difficult problems.

Let us ask ourselves a question. What are the means and purpose of perestroyka? I think that we will all have the same answer. Primarily, the deepening of democracy and the raising of the people's prosperity. The general line here is defined: Enhancement of the role of the soviets of people's deputies as the foundation of self-government by the people, as organs implementing its sovereignty and sovereign will. On this basis the time has come to redefine the CPSU's place in the Constitution and, on the other hand, to enshrine in the Basic Law the position of various social organizations operating in our society's political life.

As is well known, the 19th All-Union Party Conference advocated the complete abandonment of the substitution of organs of state power and administration and rejected the practice maintained for decades whereby party committees accumulated administrative and economic functions for which they were unsuited. The draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Congress, which has been submitted for nationwide discussion, states that the party makes no claim to a monopoly of power and is prepared for a political dialogue and cooperation with everyone advocating our society's renewal. It realizes fully just how realistic is the possibility that new political parties and various social organizations and movements may emerge in the country.

From here, too, derive the changes proposed to Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution which the party Central Committee is tabling for examination by our Congress as a legislative initiative. The essence of these proposals is that all party and public organizations and mass movements must be guaranteed equal opportunities to act within the Constitution and Soviet laws and to take an active part, through their representatives elected to soviets of people's deputies and in other ways, in shaping state policies and in managing state and public affairs. At the same time, the draft underlines the inadmissibility of setting up parties or other organizations or movements pursuing the aim of violent overthrow of the Soviet constitutional system or the integrity of the Soviet state or of undermining its security, or engaging in whipping up social, nationalist, or religious discord. In this way the

new wording of the articles in question of the USSR Basic Law is directly connected with further developing democracy, instituting political pluralism in our society, and broadening the participation of the masses of the people in running matters in all areas.

It is proposed to make radical changes also to Articles 10, 12, and 13 of the Constitution, which define the main elements in the Soviet economic system. The source of these new provisions lies in the Law on Ownership and the Fundamentals of Legislation on Land passed recently in accordance with instructions from the Second Congress of People's Deputies. Their main purpose is to do away with the alienation of workers from the means of production, to ensure to the maximum that multiplicity of forms of ownership is enshrined and encouraged, and to spur economic initiative among people. Particular importance attaches here to bringing to the fore the constitutional provisions concerning ownership by Soviet citizens, to pointing out that such ownership can include any property, not only consumer but also productive in nature, with the exception of certain types of property which citizens are not permitted to acquire. A constitutional guarantee is provided for peasant farming, inasmuch as the plots of land allocated to them will be owned for life and with the possibility of inheritance.

In the Basic Law such forms of economic operation as collective leasehold enterprise, cooperatives, companies, including those which will be set up on the basis of the voluntary association of citizens, are provided for. It is proposed that all-union ownership, republican ownership, ownership by autonomous formations and administrative territorial units be included in state ownership.

By this token, the necessary economic, legal, and organizational conditions are created for setting up a socialist market on which we base hopes for raising our economy and eliminating shortages which insult the people.

Consequently, our congress is to constitutionally formulate cardinal changes taking place in the country's economic and political life. These changes themselves, if, of course, we want to realize them, demand in turn a new approach to the organization of the leadership of the Soviet state and the provision of such an administrative mechanism that will act more effectively on order, at least than that which we have at the present time.

The inconsistant demarcation of functions of state organs; lack of clarity in defining responsibilities; a gap between their rights and degrees of responsibility—all of this lowers the effectiveness of state power, so necessary in the present conditions. In addition to this, more than anything, this is reflected in the work of the central organs. It is precisely this link which has proved itself in practical terms to be the weakest at present.

The short-term aim of political reform envisaged almost everything almost at once: Real autonomy [nezavisimost] of republics, indepenence [samostoyatelnost] of regions, new rights of local Soviets, free initiative of enterprises, legalized activity of public associations and much else, besides—and this should be emphasized—besides an effectively and efficiently functioning center.

Foreign—and our own—experience to date confirms that anything resembling democracy is unthinkable without responsibility. So, both self-government and decentralization can only properly realize their positive potential in the presence of strong—should the need arise—effectively functioning, integrating, and coordinating central power.

Here it is highly appropriate that we should avail ourselves of Lenin's advice that just "as collegiality is needed for the discussion of fundamental issues, so it is equally necessary that a single individual should have responsibility and executive power so that there is no red tape and no evasion of responsibility."

The circumstances to which I have drawn attention also lead us to conclude that we ought without delay to examine and take all measures to create a more precise system of power relations, which must operate in the conditions which will apply if the party ceases to play the role of an instrument of direct control of the state and of the economy; while that control itself is moved from the party structures to the structures of the state mechanism.

In this connection, a draft is being submitted for your attention which sets out changes to the country's Constitution which would legislatively establish the post of an individual head of state, the president of the USSR. The introduction of the institution of the presidency, as an organic part of the improvement of the Soviet state in a period when perestroyka has entered its most acute phase, must serve as a means of decisively enhancing the effectiveness of the whole machinery of power, stability, legality, and law and order in our country.

In a state as large as ours, multinational and diverse, in a situation of deepening democratization and decentralization, the consolidation of society is especially important. It is this, above all, that should be promoted by the renewal of the mechanism of a state leadership whose actions will synthesize and combine into a unified whole both domestic and foreign policy—both our strategic objectives and the real work of putting them into practice.

By all his practical work, the president of the USSR must create conditions for the development of mutual understanding and social dialogue between various social and political movements: Maintain civil peace and interethnic harmony in the country; and also act as organizer and coordinator, vested with supreme powers, in situations of emergency: Wars, conflicts, natural disasters, and serious violations of social calm and public order.

At the same time it should be underlined that even after the establishment of a presidential post our supreme body of state power remains the Congress of People's Deputies, our supreme legislative body is the USSR Supreme Soviet, and our supreme executive administrative body is the government.

The president, for his part, will be a strong connecting link between legislative and executive activities. As a result, the functions of unified Soviet state power are being given at the highest level new organizational reinforcement, and an additional guarantee that laws and other decisions of the representative bodies will be implemented.

The institution of president in our country should be consistently democratic and Soviet in nature and not only rule out any possibility of a personal dictatorship being established, but also provide reliable protection for the democratic bases of our Constitution. The draft law submitted for consideration proceeds from the view that the Soviet state needs authoritative legislative bodies, a strong president, an energetic government, and an independent judiciary. In this connection there are no grounds whatsoever for the suspicions being fanned by some about the creation of a presidential post allegedly leading to the establishment of a regime of authoritarian personal power. Moreover, the proposed draft contains a whole system of guarantees against trends of that kind.

What are these guarantees? First, the stipulation is proposed that the president is elected by universal secret ballot of citizens of the USSR. To be elected, a candidate must obtain more than half of the votes of those who take part in the election not only in the Union as a whole, but also in at least the majority of Union republics. For our federal state with its great differences in the size of the republics' populations, this issue is a matter of principle.

As for the election of the first president, it is planned that he be elected on a contested basis by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies: i.e. at the most representative democratic forum that we have today.

Second, it is proposed that the Constitution stipulate that no one person can hold the post of president for more than two terms, and there are also age limits for presidential candidates.

Third, the draft clearly specifies that the president is under the control of the Congress of People's Deputies, which is entitled to recall the president ahead of time if he violates the Constitution and laws of the USSR.

Fourthly, the draft is based on the premise that the president's powers are defined by the Constitution and by laws which, as you know, can only be adopted by the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet. The president is obliged to act on the basis of and in execution of the law.

Fifth and lastly, the Congress of People's Deputies will have the right to repeal the president's decrees and the Constitutional Supervision Committee is obliged to check on their legality.

Sometimes it may be said that the establishment of the post of president will encroach on the role of representative organs of power. This is not so. Firstly, the draft law does not envisage the transfer to the president of any powers which are currently assigned to the Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. As previously, the Congress will be able to examine and decide on any question pertaining to the governing of the USSR. Furthermore, the main reason for establishing the presidential post is to implement the decisions of the Congress and the Supreme Soviet more vigorously. Indeed, the president's entire work will be subject to examination and control by the supreme representative bodies. it will be his duty to present the Congress with a report—an annual report—on the situation in the country and also to inform the USSR Supreme Soviet about the most important questions of internal and foreign policy.

During the debate on the establishment of the post of president, it was suggested on a number of occasions that this step might contradict the tasks involved in renewing our federation, the strengthening of the sovereignty of union republics and the guarantee of the autonomy of the soviets. This, as you know, is a very complex and difficult process. But here too, the president's powers should play a positive and creative role, above all in strengthening the sovereignty of the republics, in protecting their territorial integrity and constitutional rights. I would like to stress this, comrades. It is the president who will clearly be the main initiator of the renewal of the Treaty on the Union and guarantor of adherence to it. He will arbitrate in disputes between nationalities and will facilitate the speedy solution of conflicts and disagreements, using both political and legal methods.

The formation of an important body, called the Council of the Federation, attached to the office of the USSR president, is intended to strengthen cooperation between the union republics.

Each union republic will be represented in this council by its highest state leader. The council is expected to concentrate its efforts on examining the problems of the development of our federation and implementing the nationalities policy of the Soviet state, and on ensuring the participation of republics in tackling the issues of all-union importance. Corresponding amplifications are being introduced in Article 77 of the USSR Constitution stipulating that the union republic takes part in resolving the relevant issues within the competence of the USSR, including involvement via the Council of the Federation. As is well-known, both at the session of the Supreme Soviet and in the media the apprehension has been voiced more than once whether it is expedient to establish the post of president before the country's national and state structure has been renewed as a whole. But this is a general question whose solution should be tackled by both central and republican bodies. It is hardly right to tie it up so closely with the introduction of the presidency.

One should proceed from the fact that the president will undoubtedly play an important role in elaborating new foundations of the country's federal structure. As we

agreed at the previous congress, this is most closely linked with the preparation of a new USSR Constitution. Also, according to the draft, the functions and powers of USSR president have an all-union nature and do not infringe upon the prerogatives of any republican bodies. One could only add to the above that world practice knows many federations where precisely the president, who acts as a universally recognized guarantor of the observance of the rights of the federation in general and those of each of its parts, is head of state.

Some say that the introduction of the institution of presidency may restrict the competence of the USSR Council of Ministers. One has to disappoint those advocating this point of view here, too. The government's competence remains, in fact, unchanged. Perhaps, the only new point is its enhanced responsibility for its activity. In this connection, it is envisaged that the Council of Ministers not only give an annual report-back on its work to the USSR Supreme Soviet—this is already a norm in force—but also that it should brief the president regularly about it. At the same time, it is planned to stipulate that the USSR government, ministries, and state committees must be guided in their activity, along with USSR laws, by decrees of the president who is given the right to appoint ministers, who, naturally, are subsequently put forward for endorsement by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Important state functions are invested in one more body whose establishment is proposed with the USSR president. This is the Presidential Council. Its main task is working out measures to realize the main directions of USSR domestic and foreign policy and provision of the country's security. Members of the Presidential Council are appointed by the president. And the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers will be included in it by reason of his post. In this manner a close linkage of the functions of the president is provided with executive-administrative activity and supervision [kontrol] of it on the part of the head of state.

It is precisely here in the Presidential Council, evidently, that the crucial issue of the practical realization of the economic program approved by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies will be discussed and measures will be taken to prevent this program from being bogged down and to resolutely overcome cadres' lack of responsibility at all levels.

It is precisely the Presidential Council which will become the main organizer of implementing the foreign policy course, established by the top representatives of the organs of power, as well as of all work to ensure the reliable defence of socialist gains.

Comrade deputies, I would like to recall that back at the first stage of the reform of the highest link of power lively discussions on the institution of the post of president and on the powers that should be invested in him took place in public circles, in academic literature, and the periodical press. And now many deputies, political scientists, and legal experts who are in favor of such a post, point to the fact that the top state official should not fulfill everyday functions concerned with, for instance, directing the preparation of congresses of people's deputies and sessions, with the chairmanship of parliament.

Many points of all these discussions formed the foundation of the draft law which you possess, prepared by a group of people's deputies with the active participation of leading legal scholars and other specialists. Twice this draft was examined by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and was comprehensively discussed at sittings of permanent commissions of the chambers and committees of the Supreme Soviet. The proposal on the institution of the post of president met with the support of the majority of members of the Supreme Soviet, who adopted as a basis the draft law which is now put to our Congress.

A large number of amendments and additions have been entered into the original draft, whose main originators were, in the majority of cases, the USSR people's deputies themselves.

What points of the draft submitted would I like to highlight specially? I am not dwelling on the whole draft: it had been distributed to you. You have probably noted that it is planned to dedicate a special chapter of the USSR Constitution to the president. It states the procedure of the president's election, his powers and responsibility and relationship with other state bodies.

The fact that the USSR president is required to ensure close interaction of the supreme bodies of state power and administration and unite together the fulfilment of the internal and external policies is the kernel of these powers. Such a coordinating activity of the Soviet president will become one of his key functions, which will enable us, I repeat one again, to raise considerably the efficiency of the whole of our state machinery.

Among the paramount tasks of the president is the one of securing the rights and freedoms of the Soviet citizens. He is obliged to take necessary measures to protect the sovereignty of the USSR and the Union republics and the security and territorial integrity of the country, and for the fulfilment of the principles of the national state structure. The president represents the USSR inside the country and in international relations. The leading functions of the USSR president are defined by Article 127.3 of the draft. For the fulfillment of each of them—those functions—he is endowed with corresponding powers, including the right to legislative initiative. Underpinned by this right the president will be able to actively influence the lawmaking process and to secure not only a more rapid adoption of legislative acts in the field of carrying out the economic reform, but also a day-to-day strengthening of law and order, and of the struggle with the insolent figures of the shadow economy, profiteers, bribe-takers and other criminal elements. It is being

planned to endow the USSR president with a special right that is known in world practice as the "right of suspensive veto."

According to that the president can refuse to sign a law adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and within two weeks send it back with his objections for a repeat discussion and vote. To overcome the presidential veto it is required that the Supreme Soviet confirm the decision it took earlier, by a majority vote of two-thirds in each of the chambers. If this has taken place the president either signs the law or can hand the question over the consideration to the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies.

The president's participation in settling conflicts between various structures of the highest echelons of state power is a new question for us.

So if differences arise between the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities that cannot be settled in the usual way the president is given the authority to consider the matter in dispute with the aim of working out an acceptable solution. If, at the same time, there emerges a real danger of disruption of the normal activities of the supreme bodies of state power and administration, the president is entitled to submit to the Congress of People's Deputies a proposal on the election of a new Supreme Soviet. These powers—and incidentally, similar powers exist in world parliamentary practice—are designed to ensure stability and efficiency of the top state leadership. By acting as a guarantor of observance of citizens' rights and freedoms, the president will be able to suspend the validity of government decisions if they are at variance with constitutional norms, and introduce in individual localities, after scrutiny with the relevant republican bodies, a state of emergency and also temporary presidential rule in the interests of protecting the USSR and the security of its citizens. And it is envisaged here that the conditions of a state of emergency and temporary presidential rule will be regulated by a special law. Where the introduction of a state of emergency across the entire country is concerned, this prerogative is retained in its entirety by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Another group of presidential powers pertains to forming union state bodies and putting forward candidates for election, appointment or confirmation as top officials. The president puts forward to the Supreme Soviet candidates for the posts of chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the People's Control Committee, chairman of the Supreme Court, Procurator General, and Chief State Arbiter of the USSR. It is likewise proposed that the release of these officials from their duties by the Supreme Soviet and the Congress be carried out on the president's recommendation.

It is within his powers to set before the Supreme Soviet the matter either of the resignation or of accepting the resignation of the Council of Ministers. The president is entrusted with submitting to the Congress of People's Deputies proposals on the list of members of the USSR Constitutional Supervision Committee.

The Soviet president is assigned a leading role in the sphere of the country's defense and security. By virtue of his position he is the supreme commander in chief of the Armed forces, he declares a state of war in the event of an attack on the Soviet Union and immediately submits that matter for consideration by the Supreme Soviet. He declares a general or partial mobilization, appoints and replaces the supreme command of the army and navy, confers top military titles, and appoints judges of military tribunals.

It is proposed that the president will also have a number of other powers normally held by a head of state. These include the award of orders and medals, the conferring of honorary titles of the Union, and deciding on questions of citizenship and clemency. So, the USSR president is being given quite a wide range of powers. But, at the same time, a very effective machinery of control on his activities by the supreme representatives bodies and by the Constitutional Supervision Committee is also being set up.

It will be understood that the planned changes in the structure of central power will entail substantial changes in the functions and powers of the existing Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It will no longer involve itself in presidential questions but will concentrate its attention on organizing the work of the Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. The membership of the Presidium is also clarified. It will include the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the leaders of the chambers, their deputies, and the chairmen of committees and standing commissions of the chambers. The principle that Union Republics are represented on the Presidium is retained. At their suggestion, each of them will be represented on the Presidium by one people's deputy.

That, comrade deputies, is a very brief overview of the draft laws which are being submitted for examination by the Third Congress of People's Deputies.

In summarizing what I have said, I would like to note the following: preoccupied, as we are, by the complex, innovative changes which the country is now experiencing, we often do not get a chance to take a detached look at events... from a historical perspective. If we try and do this, we can clearly see that during the last five years, immense changes have taken place in our society. Admittedly, they have not been uniform; They cannot always be described as pluses. But the essence of these changes is progressive and now, we can say, irreversible. A renewed socioeconomic and state system is being born. New institutions of state power are developing.

Indeed, they will have to fine-tuned [dodelyvat] and possibly reformulated. But, as one of our deputies correctly said, no kind uncle will give us revitalized socialism ready for use. We must build it with our own hands. This fully relates also to the renewal of the

soviets, to the creation of modern forms of representative democracy, and to the organic introduction of the democratic institution of the presidency into the structure of the republic of soviets. The amendment of clauses in the Constitution relating to the party, ownership, and the institution of the post of president proposed to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies are directly and immediately connected with the development of this process. They follow the common purpose of the further promotion of political and economic reform and the whole cause of the renaissance of public life.

Our congress is to establish a constitutional law-based framework of these major changes. This is very important, but this, comrades, is only the beginning. Constitutional prescriptions must become a living reality. And for this intense efforts will be required—not only of the future president of the country, who needs the most benevolent support, primarily through deeds, on the part of the USSR people's deputies and the whole body of our deputies.

The most active work from the soviets and all state bodies in the republics and at local level is also necessary. The direct participation of all sociopolitical organizations without exception, mass associations and movements, is demanded in governing the state and ensuring that its mechanism functions normally.

Today it is precisely practical involvement in the difficult and everyday business of government which is as necessary to us today as air, and not spontaneous rallies and critical barbs from the sidelines.

Likewise, the new constitutional norm on ownership and land use will not start working on their own. Labor collectives, Kolkhozes, and other cooperative associations, lessees and millions of toilers, by relying on them, must get moving. This will demand the most complex and most painful break—a break in human consciousness, and overcoming of fixed views and habits, and sometimes also desperate opposition to everything new. For new things do not originate in calm, they originate in movement.

The effectiveness of state authority at all levels, the unswerving implementation of the laws, strict discipline, and social justice have become a universal requirement today. The people await decisive steps for change to the country's economic situation—changes not on paper but in reality; they await positive actions from the authorities to bring order and ensure calm and safety for citizens. All of this can be attained only by combining central and local efforts, and by rallying and consolidating millions of people.

Never, Comrades, have we needed consistency, doggedness, and persistence in implementing the difficult tasks facing the country as much as we need them today. Permit me to voice the certainty that we shall do everything necessary to deal successfully with these tasks.

Medvedev on Presidential Form

LD1303002690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2041 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Speech by Deputy Vadim Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee secretary, at the Third Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow on 12 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrades deputies: I believe that each one of you is an ardent supporter of the presidential form of administration, and those who still have doubts about it, and even those who have arguments against it, sense the historic importance of the decision that we have to make. It is not for a year but for decades hence that the question is being decided today on the structure of the bodies of power. The introduction of a presidential form of administration will undoubtedly open a new phase in the development of the Soviet state system.

One may hear various arguments about the timing of this major step in our development. I do not accept the tendentious conjectures, which are unworthy of serious discussion, of a personal nature about the legalization of the power of an individual person. More frequently thoughts are being voiced to the effect that the introduction of the institution of the presidency is a kind of extraordinary measure caused by a state of crisis in the country. I agree that there is an element of truth in these arguments. A reinforcement of authority is indeed necessary to adopt major and urgent political decisions; to prevent the escalation of negative processes; and to act quickly and without delay, for these negative processes will turn into serious losses and lost time and sometimes very complex and tragic situations. We must get out of this administrative chaos and sluggishness, which have struck authority like a paralysis or a vacuum.

And yet I am profoundly convinced that the main issue does not lie here. Extraordinary circumstances dictate not so much the very need to introduce the office of president as the urgency of adopting this decision. The essence of the question lies much deeper. It lies, in my view, in the very logic of the process of democratization. What, in this sense, has happened in our country over the past year and a half to two years during the course of the reformation of the political system that has been undertaken? The main stress was put on creating institutions of people's power, shaping a democratic mechanism, and adopting political decisions. And the first results here are undoubtedly clear for all to see. The authoritarian bureaucratic system of power is steadily fading into the past. Both the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet, with all the difficulties and costs of their foundation and their growth, see how far they are from what they were two years ago. A tough parliamentary selection of government has taken place. For the first time a constitutional supervisory body has been created. Ahead lies the most important steps in broadening the rights of independence and the responsibility of the union republics and all the subject entities of our federation. The way has been paved for the true

process of handing over power from the party to state institutions. In a word, in my opinion it is impossible to disclaim the scale of the democratic changes, just as one cannot fail to see the opportunities we have missed and also our mistakes.

What is the result of all this?

A situation has arisen where the old system under which the party was the supreme body of government has become outmoded and is being dismantled. Processes are unfolding in which new parliamentary democratic systems are forming and developing. These processes, however, have not been proven to be backed to the proper extent by the creation of strong, reciprocally balanced, and mutually controlled structures in the state system; the role of these structures was formerly carried out by the party. A point has come where the vacuum that has formed with regard to executive and administrative power is leading to manifestations of an inability to govern, on the one hand; and is holding back the very process of democratization, on the other.

It is from here that the symptoms of the paralysis of power emanate. Did we foresee such a situation in which the reforms of the democratic system began? With our hand on our hearts we can say that we did not foresee it in full measure. We were carried away with the perfectly correct idea of enhancing the role of representative bodies of power, and we underestimated the mechanism of the implementation of state power. And in conditions when the CPSU is renouncing its recent monopoly situation in power, from direct participation in state administration, this can be seen clearly and distinctly.

I would like to stress the following in this connection.

The simultaneous discussion of two issues at our Congress—the introduction of a presidency and the changing of Articles 6 and 7 in the Constitution—is far from being a chance coincidence.

There is the closest profound connection between them.

On the one hand, if a strong and capable presidential power is not set up, the party's renunciation of its present functions may lead to anarchy and is fraught with unforeseeable consequences; and this cannot be allowed. On the other hand, any decisions on the president's power lose their meaning if the leading role of the CPSU continues to be recorded in the basic law.

Our whole approach in the political reformation of our system is based on the fact that the party in its previous form, the party as the nucleus of the administrative structure of the political system, should not exist in a law-based state. Therefore one should not accept the accusations that the party has somehow been clinging to, and is still clinging to, to Article 6, which provides the legislative consolidation of its leading role. But one cannot agree with the notion that the Party will soon have nothing at all to do, and that it should be virtually disbanded or limited to ruling parliamentary activity. Like any political party the CPSU will offer the people a scientifically based program of social development. Like any political party the CPSU will seek the support of the people in its strategic objectives and tasks. Like any political party the CPSU will fight for power in the conditions of comparing opinions and positions, and strive for the election of its supporters to state bodies. Like any political party the CPSU will ensure the implementation of its program, supported by the mandate obtained at the elections.

At the moment quite a few fabrications about certain maneuvers by the party for preserving its old command-and-administrative status are being launched. The transfer of power from party to state is not a tactical maneuver, but a pivotal policy of the CPSU leadership. And the sooner full-blooded democratic institutions are created, the swifter this process will take place.

In this context, permit me to voice my personal attitude on the calls that have been made today for ensuring that the president is nonparty.

First of all, in countries that have presidential rule, the head of state is the leader of the ruling party virtually everywhere. Can anyone really suppose that even if a president formally left the party leadership, that he would be capable of renouncing his political orientation?

And is it necessary to renounce the policy of a party which receives the approval of the people?

Second, under the present conditions where the party is moving away from the functions that do not pertain to it, and a process where the democratization of internal party relations is under way, one should hardly fear that the president will be bound hand and foot by party discipline. The tasks of direct state rule that the president will handle will not and must not, after all, intersect with the new functions of the party as a sociopolitical organization which develops policy and submits it to the people.

The decision on who is to head the party is ultimately the prerogative of the party itself. I personally am deeply convinced that the combination of the role of party leader and the post of head of state is not only expedient, but is also simply necessary under the current conditions.

In conclusion I would like to speak about one particular aspect of today's political situation which could be called a paradox of party criticism. I have in mind the fact that of late, people have appeared who criticize the leadership of the CPSU for everything they have done, for all kinds of mistakes without even going into the essence of problems and without suggesting any positive, constructive alternatives. One cannot help but recall the wisdom of Goethe's words: It is much easier to look for mistakes than the truth. Mistakes lie on the surface, they can be noticed straightaway, but the truth is hidden deep and not everyone can seek it out.

Many of those who criticize the party for its slowness in conducting political transformations—and to a certain extent they are correct in this—are in this case criticizing it for excessive haste. And it is precisely those comrades, who six months ago—not six months, but two months ago—were arguing—foaming at the mouth—that presidential power was essential, who are opposing most energetically the idea of a presidency that the draft CPSU platform presented. It looks as if they are acting according to the principle: Let us listen to what the CPSU Central Committee says, what Gorbachev says, and do the opposite. In my view this example demonstrates once again the lack of constructive principle on the part of the opponents of the CPSU policy. Yes, we must hurry now; otherwise the development of political processes in the country, including the most destructive ones, will far outstrip the possibilities of the state bodies to influence them. It is not simple to transfer to a presidential form of rule. In any great deed the most difficult thing is to take the decisive step. So let us take this historic step, in awareness of our very deep responsibility for perestroyka, for the country, and for the destiny of its people.

Ligachev on Lithuania, Presidency

LD1203174990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] The Congress of People's Deputies is continuing its work. During one of the intervals today, Soviet and foreign journalists surrounded Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, people's deputy. The first questions concerned the situation in Lithuania:

[Begin recording] [Ligachev] There is, it seems to me, no greater calamity as far as the people are concerned, especially when the veil has fallen from their eyes. This is my point of view.

[Reporter] How is the Politburo preparing to meet this challenge which for all intents and purposes already exists?

[Ligachev] We are working out a mechanism. The Politburo is already working in new conditions now, conditions in which we have a Supreme Soviet which is functioning. A law is being elaborated, dealing with the way in which the right of nations to self- determination, enshrined in the Constitution, can be implemented. This issue will be tackled in accordance with this law that will be passed, that is to say it will be tackled legislatively.

[Reporter] What if they do not recognize the Soviet Constitution...[changes thought] legislation? Will there be a conflict?

[Ligachev] I think we will not forecast such hypothetical things. We will be tackling this through political means; we will be tackling it within the framework of our laws.

[Reporter] Thereby do you also rule out a possible military conflict?

[Ligachev] No doubt about it—tanks will not help in this cause. We are already sufficiently wise [chuckles] and know not to repeat it. You may rest assured of this.

[Reporter] This idea of a strong president—why?

[Ligachev] Both as a communist and as a Politburo member, I generally support presidential rule. For some reason, though, you always emphasize this word strong—but I think a president is already a man that is strong enough if he has enough powers vested in him through the Constitution. I think that this is democratic, and it seems to me that it is a very important measure to strengthen the central authorities, especially in our conditions of having central authorities, in the conditions of a rapidly developing democracy and the accompanying process of decentralization of government. In these conditions this is of special importance. But, as a communist, I wish to tell you—I wish to tell you honestly and, as ever, openly—for you cannot reproach Ligachev for acting differently: I wish to tell you that it is very important, but it is our viewpoint that it is the Soviets, their whole system, from grass-roots level to the top echelons, and the party, the ruling party, the Communist Party that represent the main force that is, in the final analysis, capable of making it possible for us to break free of this most acute situation, and this is especially the cause during the transition period.

[Reporter] Are you ready to share power?

[Ligachev] That is all, comrades, thank you. I wish you health, successes. [end recording]

Afanasyev on Political System

LD1203215890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1901 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Speech by Yuriy Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow Institute of History and Archives, at the Third Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin on 12 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies: First of all, we are tackling a very difficult question. We are tackling not only the question of the office of president; we are tackling the question of the structure of state power in the Soviet Union and of a presidential form of administration. In other words, we are tackling the question of our society's political system. This question is in itself a very difficult one. We are tackling it in a very difficult situation which is loaded with, very regretfully, a great many human sacrifices. And it is this one thing which compels us indeed to be thoughtful and responsible.

But this is also a question—and, clearly, we must speak frankly about this—about the legalization of a certain individual's extraordinary power, in this case, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Do we all need this? Do perestroyka and all the citizens of the Soviet Union need this? Does the very initiator of perestroyka himself need

this? There are two sides to this question, and yet one still has the impression that a solution to this question is going to be short-lived.

We have held a meeting of the Inter-Regional Deputies Group and have adopted corresponding decisions or documents at this group; we have a resolution, an appeal to you people's deputies, to everyone, and there is also an open letter to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. I will not, of course, relate the entire contents of these documents; I will merely say that they all boil down to the fact that we have a negative attitude about this office, which is being imposed at the Congress of People's Deputies. We resolutely oppose the election of a president at the Congress. I will only relate the fundamental conclusions.

We think that the law of the Presidency could be introduced only if and when it is incorporated into an integral, unified, and organic text of the new democratic constitution. Outside such an integral constitutional context, presidential power is dangerously unpredictable, aggrevating our difficulties, worries, and fears many times over. This general proposition could be specified by the following conditions for introducing the Presidency:

First, the conclusion of the new union treaty of the sovereign states willing to join the union and willing to delegate part of their sovereign rights to the union government of their own will and initiative. Second, the formation of a plenipotentiary Supreme Soviet capable of becoming a real and not nominal, like the Congress of the People's Deputies, legislative counterbalance to the executive power. Third, the election of the president—after and on the basis of the conclusion of the union treaty—by direct, equal, and universal vote. The method of this voting is a separate question. Fourth, the system of multiparty elections under which an election of the president should be the result of a normal political struggle. In other words, presidential power also supposes a counterbalance of a real, organized onposition apart from the parliamentary counterbalance. Finally, fifth: In the convulsions of the totalitarian political regime in our country, it is especially necesary, and we have stressed this continually, that the president should not combine a post in the high party ranks with his presidential power. An important element is the freedom of the press, which, as is known, we still do not have.

One should like to say that, while accepting in principle the presidential form of government, but not considering this question indisputable—it should be discussed even in its principal sense—we consider a hasty attempt at introducing the Presidency at the Congress a gross and very grave political mistake. The situation is indeed complicated at the moment. Many people's deputies, also from the Inter-regional Group, think and are convinced that the policy carried out at this time by the country's government under the leadership of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is erratic and dangerous. And this is precisely the reason for the tense situation in the country. In other words, the real paralysis of power is a situation which really cannot be tolerated any further.

But what is the reason? The reason is not in the lack of strength in this government, but in the lack of confidence in it. A sense of fear in the society disappeared in the recent times, and along with the fear went the confidence in the present leadership.

There are reasons for this, reasons which amount to the fact that we still lack the spirit to look the truth in the face. We all see this truth in different ways in our society, and there are serious differences of opinion on this issue. For example, I am speaking not primarily to convince or reassure the people's deputies of something. I am simply appealing to everyone to recognize the existence of fundamental differences of view on the policies being carried out today, on the overall picture of our perestroyka, and on the prospects for our development. This must be acknowledged, just as one acknowledges the fact that the Presidium is sitting before you, that this rostrum is here, and that I am standing here behind this rostrum. Nothing else.

People see what is happening in different ways. From my point of view, to look the truth in the eye means first of all the need to reject the outlived communist idea. It is necessary to admit that the path which we have traversed over the past 70 years is a blind alley, and from this we can make a suitable conclusion about laying different foundations for our way of life. This is certainly not a recognition of the necessity of, or a willingness to return to, capitalism, as some think, incriminating us in their evaluations. Nothing of the kind. This also does not mean that we should draw up a new image of a radiant future and surge forward to this future. All this we had before. The question about the Presidency is being discussed at a time when there is a crisis in the society, when the policy carried out by the present leadership is suffering defeat. In these conditions, there is renewed hope in effect as a means of resolving the problems—as is suggested in this type of solution; and not only in this, but in the extraordinary situation and conditions. But we all know, from our own history, what these things are. Force—the use of force, violence—is what all our history is about.

If our leader [vozhd] and founder created foundations for anything, it is the elevation of the state policy of mass coercion and terror into principle. And besides, [noise in the audience, voice shouts: "One minute left."] he elevated lawlessness into a principle of state policy. This was continued throughout the whole Stalinist period and created numerous victims; this went through the Brezhnev period, when in a drunken stupor the national wealth was squandered wholesale and retail. And it is proposed that the same thing is to be continued, according to tradition.

Gumbaridze on 'Contradictory' Nature

LD1303013190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1949 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Speech by Givi Gumbaridze, president of the Presidium of Georgia's Supreme Soviet, at the Third Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin on 12 March—recorded]

[Excerpts] Comrade deputies, a great responsibility undoubtedly has fallen to our lot—to make a decision determining the future political appearance of our society. I do not disclaim the very institute of presidency which is so natural and effective for many civilized states with great democratic traditions. At the same time, one canot fail to recognize that in our country that form of the implementation of political power rests on highly distinctive and contradictory political and social soil. It comes as no suprise that part of society regards the high-principled post of president as the disguised transfer of monopoly power from one political focus to another, as the return to the personal model of running society. When it is a question of a concrete individual, then one can match the concrete candidate for this post with those rights with which we are ready to invest him.

Meanwhile, I would like particularly to emphasize that the people of our republic unanimously stress their support for the democratic transformations which have been carried out in the country under the leadership of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. At the same time, thoughts are expressed that the institution of the presidency should not be tied up with a concrete individual, that it is a question of the presidency as such. [passage omitted]

All our remarks in connection with the institution of the post of president of the USSR are set forth in the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic of 9 March 1990 on the guarantees of the protection of the state sovereignty of Georgia and also in the form of relevant amendments to the draft law presented for examination by the congress, and have been handed over to the drafting commission. They have been dictated by the interests of deepening the democratic transformations in the country, of the perfection of the very structure of the state, and in our profound conviction, should be taken into account. [sentence as heard]

At the same, the consistency of political reform implies that in going over to another stage, such as the institution of the post of president, it is necessary to take to their logical conclusion other questions of guaranteeing political and state sovereignty which have long been on the agenda.

The Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic confirmed the decision of its previous session on the political and legal assessment of the violation of the treaty between Georgia and Soviet Russia of 7 May 1920. Accordingly, the question is raised of the judicial illegality of the subsequent treaty relations and of the need to begin new talks on these questions.

In order to guarantee the irreversiblity of the democratic transformations in our country, the institution of the post of president of the USSR must be accompanied by the development of new principles, by the creation of real agreements which comply with generally accepted legal norms. Having embarked upon the path of democratic transformations, the rejection of political monopoly, we must be consistent to the end. That path alone, no matter how difficult and thorny it be, will bring us to the results we seek.

Thank you for your attention.

Vorotnikov Addresses Reform

LD1203222790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1929 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Speech by V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the Third Extraordinary USSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies: The experience in social restructuring that we have gained over the past few years—a difficult and painful experience—the complex ups and downs and the processes of democratization confirm as convincingly as possible that what perestroyka has initiated in the economy and in the social, political, and spiritual sphere, with the common good in mind, can have no chance of succeeding if it fails to be buttressed by firm state structures and effective institutions of power. Life constantly teaches us this simple truth—that the more rights and liberties the citizens and public institutions possess, the firmer and the more reliable the state framework at large ought to be; the stricter the public discipline ought to be; and the higher the level of the masses' political awareness and culture should be.

We do not as yet have this in our country now. If we are to tell ourselves the truth, we must admit that we are certainly not moving forward along any of all these directions. On the contrary, processes of disintegration are growing in society; labor and state discipline is declining; moral principles are becoming weaker; and crime is on the increase. Many new and fundamental laws are not working; foundations of democracy are becoming deformed; and the sovereign rights of union republics and autonomous formations fail to be appropriately protected.

All of this, of course, requires that the central power be strengthened, and that it be endowed with prerogatives that would enable it to put the process of social transformation under timely and precise guidance and control under conditions of growing diversity in the forms of political life.

Here I would like to draw your attention to the following circumstances of fundamental importance. It is understandable, comrades, that earlier, when the party governed practically all affairs of state, one could not even so much as talk of the institution of the presidency. At present, however, the party is reviewing the forms of its participation in the activities of the state—and it is precisely in this way that one should understand the new wording of Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution, proposed by the CPSU Central Committee, if, of course, the new wording is adopted by the Congress. One is discussing not only the fact that a communist party, which sets for itself the goal of playing the vanguard role in society, has no need of enshrining this role in the Constitution; the point now is that the Communist Party, under today's conditions, should be and is able to act largely in a completely different manner in regard to the state. This requires appropriate changes in the activities of the state and in its structures. In other words, it will be correct to say that it is precisely this alteration of the function of the party in the state, the increase in the number of public and political organizations, that warrants the institution of the post of president. In turn, the presence of this office will facilitate the renewal of the function of the Communist Party itself.

Here I would like to voice a wish in connection with Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev's speech. He spoke of an opposition, which is essential. I think that in essence we already have an opposition in our country; yes. The whole point is merely that it should take appropriate forms, in conformity with the law. Hence there is nothing stopping him or other comrades who share this viewpoint, nothing to prevent them from leaving the Communist Party in order to set up an organization of their own—something that is actually now provided for in the proposal regarding Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution.

As for the position that has been voiced, it is, of course, a known quantity—and as for the insulting sorties that have been allowed to occur, I think that we will allow these to remain on his conscience.

Understandably, the topic of the presidency is a new topic for us. Is it surprising that not infrequently people have questions and doubts on this score? Some say: We are proceeding along a path of broadening democracy. We are striving to involve broad masses in the affairs of state—but suddenly we place great power into the hands of one man. Won't this undermine democracy? Is it not tantamount to taking a step in the direction of dictatorship? Are we not turning back to the bad times of the personality cult? Even among us, deputies, there are also various views on this score. In my view this is natural. One should not be frightened by this, as it were. In my view, though, there are no grounds whatsoever for such fears.

There are many examples in the world to show that the institution of presidency does not entail a weakening of other state structures. On the contrary, it forms a logical and integral part of these structures, fulfilling a function that makes for greater integration and consolidation—a function that is so essential in any society.

This is extremely essential for us now. Everywhere there are calls to strengthen order and discipline in production, in state life; to reliably safeguard citizens' rights and freedoms and their social welfare provisions; and to reduce the tension in interethnic relations. These moods occur everywhere in the Russian Federation, too. The situation in our republic is not simple. There are not inconsiderable difficulties in the economy, with the mastering of the new economic mechanism; the market has been destabilized, the shortage of goods is not growing less; and there are no radical changes for the better in solving the housing problem. The sphere of interethnic relations also has complications of its own.

In order for all these knots to be untied, the republic needs political consolidation; it needs its sovereign rights expanded and strengthened; and it needs its relations with other republics and with the center to be restructured. The introduction of the post of the country's president will, it seems, have a beneficial effect on the situation in general, and on the situation in Russia in particular.

The citizens of the republic believe that this will ensure a stricter observance of the laws; and that the president will act in a manner conducive in consolidating the federative state and in strengthening the power of the soviets. We are of the opinion that the president of the country should have the powers essential for facilitating in a rea' fashion the observance of the important rights of the republics, for the strengthening of their sovereignty, and for the protection of their territorial integrity.

On the other hand, naturally, he should also ensure the observance of the all-union laws throughout the territory of our state. I think that the Soviet of the Federation, set up as a body attached to the office of the president, will effectively serve these goals, making it possible to improve qualitatively the interaction among republics and their participation in tackling the issues of all-union importance.

Naturally, comrades, I am of the view that there should be only one central authority in our country—and, likewise, the post of president in our country should also be one and only one; and I call on deputies to lend their support to the draft law that has been submitted concerning the establishment of the institution of presidency in our country. Thank you.

Congressional Debate on Presidency Reported

Political Structure Debated

LD1203191390

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian, at 1530 GMT on 12 March in its "Vremya" newscast, presents a six-minute video report by L. Khatayevich

from the Third Extraordinary USSR Congress of People's Deputies, which opened today. Following an outline of the agenda, he presents a three-minute voice excerpt of Lukyanov's report to the Congress, on the institution of the post of president. Khatayevich then presents a voice excerpt of the speech by Deputy Alekseyev [chairman of the Constitutional Supervision Committee], who says:

"We are now in a situation where power in the country has become paralyzed. The political structures have, frankly speaking, lost their former strength, while the state bodies have not acquired real state force. We ought to create a civilized, secular state that would be a guarantor of peace, calm, civic responsibility, and civil peace. We have become prisoners of the slogan 'All power to the soviets.' A purely parliamentary structure sometimes leads to an impasse and can block any decisions. I assert, on the basis of scientific data, that only an organized, structured state power begins to acquire strength on its own. The matter of the presidency, I believe, should have been resolved already. We are already late. The breakup of our social subdivisions has already begun. And this matter must be resolved without delay."

On the matter of the correlation between the presidency and sovereignty of union republics, Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, says: "Deputies from the union republics, of course, view the matter of the presidency through the prism of local problems, collating it, in principle, with the state of the social and political situation in the region. From this point of view, many issues acquire features quite different from what those in the center see. Yes, we see presidential power as an important pledge of the unity of our federation, especially in the current tense period, but crisis phenomena cannot go on forever. Sooner or later we will undoubtedly overcome this difficult stage, and then other problems will rise to their full height. I have in mind above all the sovereignty of the republics. I want to stress that we do not conceive of ourselves outside the framework of the Soviet federation. The self-government and self-financing toward which we are striving will promote not only the socioeconomic development of the republic, but also the interests of the Soviet Union as a whole. However, under these conditions presidential power in the country should acquire a somewhat different character, taking into account the obligatory presence of just such presidential power in each republic."

More on Congressional Debate

LD1203203990 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT 12 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS—The extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR opened in the Kremlin today. It is attended by more than 2,000 deputies. The Congress is discussing the main item of the agenda—amendments and supplements to the Soviet Constitution and the establishment of the presidential post.

The first working day of the Congress lasted about seven hours. An acute debate followed a report delivered by First Vice-President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov.

19 deputies spoke on the first day.

The speeches delivered at the Congress confirmed that there are many more supporters of the institution of executive presidency among participants in the Congress than those who oppose this idea.

Sergey Alekseyev, chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Compliance, stressed the urgent need for the post of president. He said that political structures have lost their erstwhile power, while state bodies have still not acquired it. In these conditions the Presidency is the only effective method to transfer the power from party structures to state bodies, he believes.

Member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, Deputy Vadim Medvedev told the Congress that there is a close and profound relationship between the discussion of the executive Presidency and the change of the Constitution's articles registering the leading role of the Soviet Communist Party in society.

The idea of establishing the post of president at the present stage was questioned by the opposition Interregional Group of deputies. Explaining the group's stand, one of its co-chairmen and rector of the Moscow Institute for Historian Archivists, Yuriy Afanasyev said he wanted the presidency to be made conditional upon a new federal treaty among the republics wishing to remain in the USSR, the existence of a strong parliament and president's election in conditions of a real multiparty system.

The debate will be continued tomorrow. Representatives of a number of federal republics, including Baltic republics, where a complex situation developed, are expected to speak.

Opening the Congress today, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that a Lithuanian representative is absent from the Congress' Presidium as a parliamentary session is under way in Lithuania. Gorbachev said that the information that is coming from Lithuania is rather alarming.

The Congress instructed the Soviet parliament and government to study the situation that is shaping in connection with the decisions taken by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, and to assess them and draw appropriate conclusions.

Election of President Questioned

LD1203125490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] After the break, the discussion started at the congress session. However, prior to this, Dmitriyev, a deputy from Leningrad, mounted the rostrum. He proposed that debates should not be opened, but that it should be decided by vote whether presidential rule would be introduced in the country and whether the president would be elected at this congress or at some other time. Deputy Dmitriyev's proposal was to all intents and purposes repeated also by Deputy Belozertsev. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed the view that the adoption of a correct decision on this very important matter should take place after it had been discussed in detail. A vote was taken and as a result of it the proposal of Deputies Dmitriyev and Belozertsev was not adopted. Thus the congress moved on to the debates.

The first to mount the rostrum was Aleksey, chairman of the Constitutional Supervision Committee. He stressed that he would voice a number of thoughts, not as the head of the recently formed committee, but as a specialist who had for many years devoted himself professionally to the questions now being discussed. First of all he noted the fact that at the present time power in the country has turned out to be ineffective. The previous political structures are virtually inoperative and the new ones have not yet been formed completely. In this connection three main factors are so far oppressing the minds of society: firstly, the fact that the state is so far being regarded by us as a body of pressure and command; second, Deputy Alekseyev stressed, we have become prisoners of the slogan: All Power to the Soviets, that is to say, all power to the collective bodies. It is of course a good thing when the congress and the Supreme Soviet are operating, Alekseyev said, but surely there are certain major shortcomings here; and, third, the division of powers is primitively interpreted as a division of functions.

Meanwhile, only an organizational, structured state power assumes real force where legislative, executive, and judicial power are balanced. On the basis of everything he said, Deputy Alekseyev voiced the view that it is necessary to tackle the questions of presidential rule forthwith. He even intimated that the deputies have been late with this, that it was necessary to tackle this previously.

The discussion is now continuing. Deputy Nazarbayev is on the rostrum. And at this point I end my report from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Presidential Power Discussed

LD1203143290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1200 GMT on 12 March carries a 15-minute roundup by correspondent Olga Vasilenko on the proceedings at the morning sitting of the Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow.

After Lukyanov's report, she notes, deputy Dmitriyev spoke, asking that the issue of whether or not to introduce presidential power should be decided, as should that of how to elect a president. She states this suggestion contradicted the original agenda which was, after a vote, adhered to so that the debates could open.

Alekseyev, chairman of the constitutional supervision committee, was first to speak. He says: "Is now the time to be deciding the matter of a presidency? As I see it, the matter of the presidency should have been decided already. The collapse of the categories of our society is already beginning, and this question must be decided immediately, in my opinion. I have just come back from France and talked to some of the country's most important lawyers and they are saying: Where are youg going? Can you really not see that your state system has started to collapse? Isn't our experience of 1958 an object lesson for you? What if it is a hard decision, a difficult decision? It has to be taken. I would like to add that perhaps from outside one cannot tell that this decision is linked to the most significant alterations of our political system, for these most significant changes refer to the introduction of a multiparty system means the further collapse of our social system and a tendency toward breaking up. Moreover, a presidency could, in present conditions, be the only genuine way of transferring real power from the party structures to the state."

Another deputy calls for a variety of speakers at the congress rather than always the same ones. Gorbachev notes that it all depends on the secretariat receiving notes from those who wish to speak. Academician Utkin points out that this was his first time at the rostrum, and he links the matter of the presidency with the process of disarmament and conversion that are currently under way.

Deputy Nazarbayev, chairman of the Kazakhstan Supreme Soviet, considers the matter of a presidency from the republics' point of view and raises the issue of how efficiently the existing bodies of authority work at present. More work needs to be done on the law on ownership, he says.

Vasilenko continues: "Deputy Afanasyev spoke on behalf of the Interregional Group and said that the position of the group and that expressed in the report and deputies' speeches at the session of the Supreme Soviet do not coincide. He spoke about the group's negative reaction to introducing the post of president at the congress and to electing a president at the congress."

Deputy Yeliseyev says: "The question arises quite legitimately for many people as to whether it is worth our while being in a hurry to introduce presidential government. Perhaps it would be better first to prepare its legislative base and work out the procedure for elections and to come to electing a president via these stages. I

agree with a number of opinions put forward here by Comrade Afanasyev but, at the same time, I believe we have no time to be dragging our heels. We must not leave the country without real government. We must hasten to fill the vacuum that is forming before our eyes as party bodies move away from dealing with the tasks of state. Moreover, we can sense that we are not making any headway in implementing those laws that are being adopted by the Supreme Soviet today. Finally, it seems to me that we should, even now, be ridding the state structure itself of any possibility for restoring the old regime."

The introduction of a president was also favored by deputies Safiullin, Dementey, and Vorotnikov.

Vasilenko concludes: "The morning session ended with the election of an Editorial Commission. The congress continues its work at 1600."

Congress Evening Session Proceedings Reviewed

LD1203164890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] The Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Over to the all-union radio correspondents' office in the Kremlin. Marina Novitskaya is at the microphone:

[Novitskaya] The evening sitting of the Conrgess began an hour ago, and quite a few speakers have already spoken. Deputy Gumbaridze, chairman of the Presidium of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, opened the debate at the evening sitting. He stressed that a great responsibility had undoubtedly fallen to the lot of the Congress of People's Deputies. However, from his point of view, the draft law proposed to the Congress on the institution of the post of president takes little account—as he put it—of the fact that our country is a union of sovereign states. A disproportionate shift of power to the center is at variance with the rights of the republics: That, at any rate, is the view of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, which expressed its comments in the decision of 9 March.

Viktor Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, who was the next to speak, expressed the opinion that the introduction of the post of president is dictated by the logic of development of the democratic transformations in our country. The deputy considers it a mistake that the adoption of a new constitution and conclusion of a new union treaty were postponed. However, the introduction of the institution of a presidency will actually help to speed up these processes. Mironenko, like many other deputies, is undoubtedly an advocate of a nationwide election of the president, but he considers that in the situation which has evolved, the president can and needs to be elected at the current Congress, by way of an exception.

The speech by Dorokhov, first secretary of Bobrovskiy Rayon Party Committee, Voronezh oblast, did not seem to me to come across very well. The speaker devoted most of it to the extremist forces, as he put it, which are channelling the situation in the country in a destructive direction. True, it was not clear from the speech exactly what forces the deputy had in mind by the word extremists. He voiced the idea that the existence of both the congress and the Supreme Soviet at the same time is hardly justified. Dorokhov unfortunately used a somewhat unparliamentary expression about the members of the Supreme Soviet, saying, in particular, that parliament at times works according to the law of the jungle. In accordance with the procedural regulations, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in the chair, drew attention to this.

Deputy Shmelev, head of a section at the Institute of the United States and Canada, supported unambiguously the immediate introduction in the country of the post of president. He thinks that presidential rule is needed both with regard to the long-term, and in the specific complex situation in the country. Deputy Shmelev devoted particular attention to the economic situation, and expressed the following opinion: A way out of the economic crisis cannot be painless, and most probably one will even have to make unpopular decisions. Here the authority of the president should play its role.

Deputy Ibragimov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Uzbekistan, also favors the institution of the presidency, but he thinks that a number of provisions of the draft law, submitted for consideration, require additional and more precise definition.

Deputy Batyshev, adviser and member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, also spoke.

Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev is now at the rostrum. So at this point I finish my report from the Kremlin.

Congress Participants Hold News Conference

LD1203154290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Mar. (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The question of instituting a presidency in the Soviet Union, which is being discussed at an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies which opened here today, also provoked lively interest at the first news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. There are quite a few journalists accredited at the congress—1,200 Soviet journalists and 500 representatives of the mass media of foreign countries.

Speaking at the news conference, Veniamin Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice, described the idea of introducing presidential power in the country as "a logical step forward by society along the road toward creating a law-governed state." In his words it is the very institution of the presidency that "will make it possible to resolve some of the most important problems of society in the fields of the economy, politics, asserting and

defending the rights and freedoms of citizens, and developing democracy and glasnost."

Recalling that new legislative structures have begun operating in the Soviet Union, he noted that "executive power remains the country's weakest link." Instituting a presidency, continued the minister, "makes it possible to strengthen and balance three areas of state power: legislative, executive, and judicial."

The journalists were interested in the question of whether the introduction of the presidency in the country is connected with the forthcoming abolition of Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution, in which the leading role of the CPSU is enshrined. Answering it, a participant of the opposition interregional deputies' group Sergey Stankevich said that this link was obvious. Recognizing the expediency of the presidential power in the country, the deputy nevertheless expressed a number of reservations connected with the timescale for holding elections of the new head of the state. In the conditions of a multinational state, Sergey Stankevich thinks, the president must be elected not at the congress but by nationwide suffrage.

Veniamin Yakovlev did not subscribe to this viewpoint. He stressed that an acute political situation has today in the country. In various regions, he said, the danger arises for the life and safety of the country's citizens. "And in these conditions, too long a delay in strengthening executive power may cost a high price for the country," the minister said.

The journalists were particularly interested in the alternative candidates for the post of USSR president. Sergey Stankevich said that the Interregional Group "has decided not to put forward alternative candidates for the post of president."

Sergey Stankevich's statement therefore refutes the predictions made by some foreign mass media that the group's co-chairman would be proposed at the congress as an alternative candidate for the post of USSR president.

Further on News Conference

LD1203214990 Moscow TASS in English 2047 GMT 12 Mar 90

["By TASS parliamentary correspondent"]

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS—There will be no recurrence of a totalitarian regime, a regime of personal power, in the Soviet Union, say participants in the Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies who spoke at a press conference at the end of its first working day. The congress discussed the institution of an executive presidency in the USSR.

People's Deputy Anatoliy Sobchak stressed, among other things, that the new wording of the bill provides for sufficient legal guarantees to prevent the Soviet presidency sliding into dictatorship. At the same time, he said that it was necessary to define more clearly the functions of two supreme authorities—the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet, and to create a strong and independent judicial authority.

People's Deputy Fyodor Burlatskiy believes that the main guarantees of preventing a totalitarian regime are mostly of a political and not legal nature and that the creation of a multiparty system is one of them. Burlatskiy is sure of the effectiveness of proposed legal guarantees, such as the ability to recall a president, to give a vote of confidence or no-confidence to the government, and, consequently, to replace it on the initiative of the Supreme Soviet. He said that it was necessary to adopt as soon as possible the law on the press that could guarantee the freedom of discussion and criticism of government actions and the performance of the president.

Speaking about the personality of Gorbachev whom he described as "the most probable and real candidate" to the post of president, Burlatski stressed: "I do not see any symptoms that Gorbachev's presidency can lead to a regime of personal or authoritarian rule."

Gorbachev Opens 13 March Congress Session

LD1303073590 Moscow TASS in English 0729 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies continues in the Kremlin for the second day. The Congress is being attended by about 2,000 deputies.

The morning session was declared open by President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev.

The congress has been called to decide the question of instituting the office of an executive president in the Soviet Union and to introduce a number of changes to the country's Constitution.

A keen discussion followed a report delivered at the Congress on Monday by First Vice President Anatoliy Lukyanov.

Deputies' remarks—there were 19 speakers on Monday—confirmed that the number of supporters of the executive presidency in the Soviet Union is much larger than that of opponents.

The discussion is expected to continue today. Representatives from a number of union republics, including the Baltic republics, are expected to take the floor.

Gorbachev Briefs Congress on Lithuania

LD1303095690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] The Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies is continuing its work. We are linking up with the correspondents' office in the Kremlin palace of Congresses. Aleksandr Ruvinskiy is at the microphone.

[Ruvinskiy] At the beginning of today's session Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev briefed deputies, at their request, on the situation in Lithuania. He said the Sejm of Lithuania, this is what the republic's Supreme Soviet is now called, had adopted an appeal to the congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet that confirms that, on the basis of a legal evaluation of the events of 1940, many state decisions of that period cannot be regarded as valid. A number of questions concerning Lithuanian statehood were raised. Mikhail Sergeyevich remarked that one has yet to give a political and legal evaluation of this appeal. He also raised a number of telegrams from Lithuania in which collectives expressed their protest against the decisions adopted by the Sejm. He noted these issues will be discussed at one of the next sessions of the Supreme Soviet while talks at a state level can be held only with foreign states, and Lithuania is not one.

Debates on introducing a presidency in the country and amending the Constitution then started. In fact, they continued yesterday's debate. They were started by Deputy Khodzhakov from Turkmenistan. He supported the introduction of a presidency and suggested a number of editorial amendments to the draft. Deputy Plotnieks, professor from Lithuania noted that a compromise decision acceptable to everyone should be taken. The speaker dwelled in detail on a number of articles of the draft law and noted, in particular, that presidential powers have been enhanced thanks to the parliament and republics and that the Soviet of the Federation does not have adequate powers, and all that infringes upon the rights of republics. The presidential powers in extreme situations, for example, when introducing a state of emergency, have not been clearly defined. The nature of mutual relations between the parliament and the president is not clear, and in connection with this the deputy proposed to eliminate some articles from the draft law.

Deputy Korshunov stressed the institution of presidential power is a consistent continuation of the course toward democratization. He described the Supreme Soviet as a strong body capable of withstanding any deformations that can arise during the execution of presidential power. Deputy Korshunov gave his support to the activity of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev but criticized him for a certain inconsistency.

Akayev, president of the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences, also spoke in favor of presidential power. He submitted editorial amendments to the draft and noted that it was very important who the country's first president would be, and put forward Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's candidacy. Deputy Antanaytis spoke on behalf of Lithuania's people's deputies and the republican Supreme Soviet. He noted that a session of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet had been underway for the third day; he read excerpts from some of its documents. They included the act on restoring independence to the state. It said that, as of now, Lithuania became an independent state officially named the Lithuanian Republic.

At the moment, the discussion of draft laws is continuing at the Supreme Soviet session and we will be keeping you current about its work. The next report will be at 12.30 [0930 GMT]

More on Lithuanian Issue

LD1303105590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] We turn again to the Extraordinary Third Congress of People's Deputies, which resumed its work at ten o'clock [0700 GMT] this morning. [passage omitted] How did this morning's sitting begin? We have just received this report:

[Correspondent] Today the Kremlin is the scene of the second day of the Extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The morning sitting was opened by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Work began with a question from a number of deputies to Comrade Gorbachev on the situation in Lithuania.

[Gorbachev] This morning we have been talking about this [Lithuania]. A commission headed by Comrade Ryzhkov has begun work on this from the government angle. From the Supreme Soviet angle, I believe similar work is now already going on in the chamber. The main issue of all is to submit this issue to the Supreme Soviet immediately after the Congress concludes.

You will have noticed the Lithuanians—and representatives of Estonia and Latvia are joining them in this—are proposing we conduct talks with them. My feeling is that there can be no question of any talks. Talks are something we conduct with foreign states. Until the whole situation is clarified. [applause heard in chamber. Video shows shots of, first a group of about 20, then a broader shot of 100-200 deputies, does not make it clear who is applauding] Until the whole situation is clarified jointly, within the framework of the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet of Nationalities and the government, and it has all been assessed we shall be continuing to work as we work now. We welcome the fact there are deputies from all republics, including Lithuania too, present here. So there you have it.

[Correspondent] The debate begun yesterday on the main point on the agenda—amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution and the institution of the post of president of the country—resumed. Deputies' interventions showed that a majority at the congress supports the idea of creating an institutional presidency and those changes to the Constitution proposed by the CPSU

Central Committee plenum with a view to changing Articles 6 and 7 of the Basic Law. It has been decided to proceed to a vote on the draft law as submitted after the break, when the two hours of debate are over. The sitting is continuing its work.

Deputies' Remarks Reviewed 13 March

LD1303115190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] [Announcer] The third extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies is continuing its work. As always on such days our program includes a direct relay from the correspondents' post at the Kremlin. On the line is our parliamentary correspondent, Marina Novitskaya.

[Novitskaya] Good morning.

[Announcer] Hello.

[Novitskaya] This morning before continuing the discussion of the main issue, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev briefed the deputies, at their own request, on the situation in Lithuania. He reported that the Lithuanian Sejm, as the republic's Supreme Soviet is now called, had adopted an address to the congress and to the Supreme Soviet. Based on a legal appraisal of the events of 1940, the deputies of the Lithuanian Sejm consider the decisions of that time invalid. At the same time the congress is receiving telegrams from collectives, enterprises, and citizens that protest these decisions. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev believes all the documents should be assessed legally and politically and believes it expedient to discuss this issue at the next session of the Supreme Soviet.

As you will recall, representatives of seven republics did not have time to speak in the debates on the issue of the presidency yesterday. They all took the floor today. First to speak was Deputy Khodzhakov, first secretary of the Tashauz Oblast Party Committee in Turkmenia. According to this speaker, the process of dividing legislative, executive and judicial power, as should be the case in a state based on law, is under way but in a contradictory manner. We did not think to coordinate their activities, the deputy said, and a collegiate body like the Supreme Soviet Presidium cannot cope with this quickly enough. For this reason, Deputy Khodzhakov spoke in favor of instituting a presidential office. Andris Plotnieks, a professor at the Latvian State University, said that some people see hope in presidential power while it causes concern for others. A compromise decision was needed. Deputy Plotnieks is a lawyer and all his proposals were extremely specific. In his opinion, the draft law needs improvements. In particular, it increases the power of a president at the expense of parliament and in many cases the union republics lose the possibility of influencing decisions of state.

I think the deputies will remember the emotional speech by Deputy Korshunov, a member of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture. Basically, he was thinking aloud: Might it not be that a future president would subsume other institutions of power and might this step not lead to an authoritarian form of government? The deputy's view on this was unequivocal. He answered, and I think with justification, in the negative and believes, moreover, that introducing the institution of presidential power is consistent with continuing the drive to democratize society. If a positive decision were made, said Deputy Korshunov, regarding the institution of presidential office, I should like to see Mikhail Gorbachev in the job.

Essentially, support for introducing the institution of presidential office and electing a president at the current forum came from Deputy Akayev, a scientist from Kirghiziya; and Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Tajikistan Communist Party. They all had their own convincing reasons favoring such a decision. Above all, Deputy Arutyunyan, for example, believes it is not only authoritarian authority, but indecisive authority that is fraught with grave consequences. He referred to his own region's experience, a sad and tragic experience, and voiced the opinion that the country is now in need of a mechanism that would be able to forestall such a development of events.

Naturally, however, not all were of the same opinion today. Writer Dabizha, for instance, from Moldavia, believes that prior to introducing a new institution of authority it is essential to renew the Constitution, review the contract of the union and delimit the powers of the union republics and the center. Deputy Antanaytis from Lithuania addressed the session. He was speaking on behalf of the people's deputies of that republic and of its Supreme Soviet. He cited excerpts from several documents adopted at its session, notably from the act on the restoration of the independence of the State of Lithuania.

Deputy Blokhin, however, who was speaking on behalf of the Soyuz Deputies Group, called for the development of events like those in Lithuania not to be tolerated and also made a statement to have the Lithuanian issue included on the congress agenda. He stressed it is precisely in conditions in which relations between the nationalities had dramatically worsened that the introduction of the institute of president is essential. He proposed three candidates to stand for the office of president, who had been nominated at a meeting of the Soyuz Group. These were Bakatin, Gorbachev, and Ryzhkov.

I should like to tell you about one more speech. Deputy Polozkov made sharp and, in my opinion, not always objective criticism of the Supreme Soviet. The press came in for its share, too. There is currently a break at the session. After it, Deputy Kozhedub is expected to speak. He has asked to speak on behalf of Heroes of the Soviet Union.

Congress Limits Debate, To Vote on Presidency

LD1303092290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0830 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, 13 Mar—This morning the USSR extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, which opened in the Kremlin on Monday, continued discussion of the main point on the agenda: changes to the country's constitution and the establishment of the post of president. It is already clear that far from all of those who wish to speak will manage to do so. At the end of yesterday's proceedings, 288 people had registered for the debate, but only 19 managed to speak.

It has been decided to move on to a vote on the bill after two hours of debate at today's morning session. This document combines both innovations related to the introduction of the post of president, and the proposal by the CPSU Central Committee to change the articles of the Constitution which enshrine the leading role of the Communist Party. [passage omitted: summary of yesterday's proceedings]

Speeches by representatives of the Union republics continued at today's morning session.

Interregional Groups Opposes Presidency Bill

LD1303093990 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT 13 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—The discussion of the main item on the agenda—changes in the country's Constitution and the institution of the office of an executive president—continued at the extraordinary Congress of the USSR People's Deputies this morning. The congress opened in the Kremlin on Monday.

It is clear already now that not everyone who wanted to take the floor will be able to do so. The list of prospective speakers in the debate already included 288 people by the end of Monday. Only 19 speakers took the floor.

It was decided that a two-hour debate at today's morning session would be followed by a voting on the bill. The document combines both novelties connected with instituting the office of an executive president and the proposal of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee to change the Constitution's articles that seal a leading role of the Communist Party.

The first day of the congress proceedings showed that the majority of deputies supported the idea of the presidency. Arguments in favor of instituting presidential rule are primarily that the CPSU's departure from the administration of the state may produce a dangerous vacuum of power. The need to cardinally improve the coordination of action between the legislative and executive power is pointed out and other weighty arguments are adduced.

The interregional group of deputies opposes the adoption of the presidency bill. It believes that it is necessary first to adopt a new constitution of the USSR and a new national state structure. To introduce a multi-party sytem and only then raise the question of instituting the presidential post which is new to the Soviet Union.

Various positions were expressed by representatives from union republics. Deputies from Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation supported the introduction of the presidency. Representatives from Georgia and Azerbaijan voiced misgivings that an executive president might infringe the sovereignty of republics.

Representatives from union republics continued to take the floor at the morning session today.

Ryzhkov, Bakatin, Gorbachev Named for Presidency

LD1303091690 Moscow TASS in English 0910 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin have been named, along with Mikhail Gorbachev, as candidates for the presidency.

The candidacies were suggested by the deputies' group Soyuz which unites deputies who are aiming to keep the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union under conditions of a renewed federation.

Although an official nomination of candidates will take place in the afternoon, the group Soyuz named its candidates during a debate at the morning session.

Debate on Presidency in 'Final Stretch'

LD1303100890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Excerpts] The Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies is continuing its work. Over to the correspondent's center in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Aleksandr Ruvinskiy is at the microphone.

[Ruvinskiy] The interval in the morning session is now coming to an end, and it must be said that for two hours before the interval there was a very, very acute discussion going on, in my view. I have invited Aleksey Mikhaylovich Yemelyanov, a people's deputy and an academician of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, into the studio to share his impressions of the issues raised and perhaps also of the nature of the discussion itself. So, Aleksey Mikhaylovich, what are your impressions of today's work?

[Yemelyanov] I wanted to stress right away that our congress has come out into the final stretch in resolving the issue of introducing presidential power in the country. In literally an hour or two we will essentially, most probably, start voting. [passage omitted]

[Ruvinskiy] Aleksey Mikhaylovich, we have been holding you back in our studio. During this time the sitting has begun. Mikhail Sergeyevich has just proposed that the floor be given to Deputies Kozhedub and Drunina, and that the debate be ended there. But many deputies have requested the floor, and at the moment there is in fact a discussion on how to go on, whether to end the debate or to continue it. Well, we will inform our Mayak listeners in forthcoming bulletins, while the next direct hook-up from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on Mayak will be at 1430 [1130 GMT]. We will end this report here.

Congressional Session 13 March Reviewed

LD1303115490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0955 GMT 13 Mar 90

[by TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—At the Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies the discussion is coming to an end on the main point on the agenda—on the changes to the USSR Constitution and institution of a post of president of the country.

It was chiefly representatives of the union republics who spoke at today's morning session.

Vaydotas Antanaytis, a deputy from Lithuania, noted that a session of the supreme legislative organ of the republic is into its third day in Vilnius, and he briefed participants at the congress on a number of documents adopted at the session. In particular, he read excerpts from the act on restoring an independent Lithuanian state. The document asserts that in 1940 Lithuania was incorporated into the USSR by force. The Lithuanian SSP is being renamed the Lithuanian Republic. The deputy went on to announce the invalidation of USSR legislative acts on the territory of Lithuania.

As has already been reported, speaking at this morning's sitting of the congress, Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet described the decision on the independence of Lithuania "illegal and invalid." He likewise pointed out that "there can be no question" of any talks with Lithuania. "We hold talks with foreign states," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

The Lithuanian representative also stated that the deputies from this republic do not regard themselves empowered to participate in adopting the law on establishing the post of the USSR president and in the election of the country's president, inasmuch as, in his words, they are present at the congress only in the capacity of observers.

A deputy from Latvia, Andris Plotnieks criticized the draft law on the presidency. He feels that the draft "deliberately complicates the organization of power." The establishment of the institution of the presidency, the deputy asserted, has an effect on the character of relations between the union and the union republics, and aggravates the imbalance between structures of the organization of power.

Speaking in favor of election of a president of the USSR at the current congress, Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the central committee of the Armenian Communist Party stressed that the institution of a presidency would be a guarantee of unity of a renewed federation, of the stability of the state, and of the sovereignty of the union republics. This position was supported by Kakhar Makhkamov, leader of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, Ovlyakuli Khadzhakov, representative of Turkmenia and first secretary of the Tashauz CPSU Oblast Committee, and by Askar Akayev, president of the Academy of Sciences of Kirghizia.

Voices were also to be heard in opposition. Thus, Nikolay Dabizha, a representative of Moldavia, said that necessary conditions for introducing the post of president of the USSR are first to revise the treaty of the union, ensure clear delineation of the functions of the union and of the republics, and guarantee their sovereignty.

Deputy Salambek Khadzhiyev, manager of an enterprise in Checheno- Ingushetia, northern Caucasus, spoke on behalf of the country's autonomous formations. He qualified his support for instituting a presidency with the condition that autonomous areas be given the same rights as union republics have in the near future.

Marshal Ivan Kozhedub, famous World War II ace, poetess Yuliya Drunina, and others spoke in favor of instituting a presidency. Yuriy Blokhin, a scientist from Moldavia, who spoke on behalf of the "Soyuz" group of deputies (it comprises about 300 USSR people's deputies, who have as their goal the preservation of the country's territorial integrity), spoke in favor of electing a president at the current congress. On behalf of the "Soyuz" group he proposed as candidates for the post of USSR president Vadim Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, and Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the current government of the country, alongside Mikhail Gorbachev.

Ivan Polozkov, first secretary of the Krasnodar Kray Committee of the CPSU (southern Russia) spoke in favour of establishing without delay the post of the head of state and his election at the current congress. He stressed that this post is a counterbalance to decentralization.

After the conclusion of the debate, the congress moved on to an article-by-article consideration of the draft law on changes to the USSR Constitution.

Political & Social

Multiparty System Necessary for Democracy

PM0903203590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[IZVESTIYA Political Observer Stanislav Kondrashov "Viewpoint" article: "Multiparty System Is the Foundation of Democracy"]

[Text] Next week the extraordinary Third Congress of People's Deputies is to examine and adopt the law on the presidency and elect the USSR president. An important new change will be made to the edifice of our society and state, which is undergoing perestroyka. Its significance and efficacy will be determined by political practice rather than by debates.

In the debates, most recognize the need for a presidency, although they vary in their emphasis. Some political scientists and commentators, alarmed by the existing "shortage" of power, see the establishment of the post of president as a recipe for civilized conduct and a means for overcoming the deep crisis in which the Soviet Union finds itself at the present stage of perestroyka. Others, displaying caution, are proposing the more scrupulous elaboration of a system of "checks and balances" to ensure that the new strong executive branch is accompanied from its first steps by a no less strong legislative branch in the shape of a parliament.

I would like to share with you a number of ideas, in view of my own experience as a foreign affairs journalist who has observed the nature and operation of presidential power in the United States. I favor the post of president, but I regard it not as a panacea dictated by the accumulating emergencies, but rather as an attempt to exit the historical impasse in which the dictatorship of party power, which was not accountable to the people, has landed the country. The presidency is not an end in itself. It is part of a whole. The whole consists of creating effective people's power, which, in my view, must without fail include a well considered and planned multiparty system.

This system cannot, of course, be constructed artificially. But it must be sought purposefully, without putting up barricades in the path of the new phenomenon which is hammering on our door. It is also necessary to be mindful that the historical need for a multiparty system is long overdue and is loudly making its presence felt in the streets and the squares through the activities of "informal" organizations, alliances, and blocs of a political nature and in disputes inside the CPSU itself, where conservative and reformist currents have appeared.

However, the CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th congress is characteristically half-hearted in this respect. On the one hand, the need to abolish Article 6 is belatedly recognized. On the other hand it states very feebly and vaguely: "The development of society also does not rule out the possibility of the establishment of parties." (Other parties, that is, apart from what are termed "new sociopolitical associations of citizens.")

In connection with the introduction of the institution of the presidency the transition to a multiparty system assumes even greater urgency and topicality. A strict division of power between the executive, legislature, and judiciary provides the necessary balance in the management of the state and a guarantee against the usurpation of power. However, an even firmer basis of democracy is the freedom of political parties and currents on which the aforementioned triad, properly speaking, rests. Despite our desire to plow our own furrow, the experience of civilized states should, without unnecessary delays, convince us that a strong parliament as a necessary counterbalance to a strong president will not come about automatically if this parliament is essentially a one-party parliament made up of representatives of the same party as is headed by the president. I will express an idea which to us still sounds all but seditious, though in world parliamentary practice it sounds banal: A strong parliament is not possible without a strong intraparliamentary opposition. By constantly proposing alternatives, the opposition seeks to boost its influence among the people and to win over voters, who represent the highest court of democracy. Thus the opposition not only does not hamper but rather spurs on its rivals in the ruling party or the ruling coalition. Pluralism of opinions which is not organized in parties and not formulated in the platforms of opposition forces is sufficient merely to demonstrate the external aspect of democracy, but by no means to make it effective.

Incidentally, it is precisely the opposition's amorphousness, its semilegal status, so to speak, which is, moreover, is being tested by the authorities, which is the explanation of the unproductive unruliness of rallies and the timewasting in Supreme Soviet debates. Everyone for himself, everyone only with his own voice—in conditions of such pluralism it is difficult to translate words into actions, which essentially is the explanation for people's growing disillusionment with the first experiences of our democracy. This is likely to further intensify after the local soviets elections. Given that there are 10, 15, and sometimes even 25 candidates per seat in the Russian parliament, this is window dressing and mumbo jumbo rather than democracy. Such candidates are a pig in a poke, they promise anything you like because they can easily backtrack on their promises, claiming that one man cannot win a war and blaming everything on the "accursed apparatus"' absolute power. Apart from that, single-handed, without access to the mass media, it is difficult to reach voters (it is no accident that among the candidates and winners there are many journalists—their job is a great help).

And the outcome? Many voters did not turn up to vote, because they did not know the candidates and refused to take the elections seriously. A runoff has been arranged in an enormous number of districts since not one of the many candidates obtained a majority. Is it not clear that we will not get far with that kind of democracy, but will

discredit the idea of democracy pretty quickly—particularly when in the new soviets the lone deputies will be at sixes and sevens.

And how is the president going to be elected by universal direct suffrage at the next election? Are there also going to be 25 candidates? A runoff? If one takes the American practice, there **eight or nine months before the presidential election you have primaries beginning in many states, which mean the selection of contenders within the two main parties** and enable independent candidates (invariably doomed to fail) to test their strength.

The institution of the presidency in the Soviet Union is dictated, I repeat, not only by the current situation and the perfectly understandable desire to establish order by endowing the head of state with the proper powers. The institution of the presidency is a farewell to the past and a welcome to the future. The authoritarian nature of power, to which we are now bidding farewell, was rooted in the fact that it managed without a mandate given by a majority of voters at democratic elections. Despite all arguments to the contrary, the source of power was not the people, but the party, which has less than one-tenth of the people in its ranks, or, to be more accurate, its leadership, the very top—the Politburo. In state terms, Stalin and Khrushchev were chairmen of the Council of Ministers, and Brezhnev, Andropov, and Chernenko were chairmen of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, but this is not what determined their status. It was just an adjunct to the chief post of general—or, in Khrushchev's case, first—secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It was not the substance, but merely the form in which the supreme power in a monopoly, one-party system was presented to the people and to the outside world. Now the break with the authoritarian past is to be one of substance. The president's chief role will be that of president to everyone, not the leader of the party and, through it, of the people. In effect this will be a renunciation of the party monopoly of power and the concentration of power in constitutional state structures.

But you cannot have democracy without a choice of alternatives, and the responsible choice should be made not from any Tom, Dick or Harry, but from people who have been selected in advance by groups, organizations, and parties, which represent the main forces active in the political arena and put forward together with their candidates **programs or platforms that are binding in one way or another.** There is no other way to organize an effective political life and political struggle. This is the logic of the transformations that led us to introduce the presidency and prompted the need to strengthen the parliament and inevitably lead to a multiparty system. If we turned a blind eye to this we would be dragging our feet again.

Without looking into the future, bidding farewell to the past loses its meaning.

Paradoxical though it may appear at first glance, in contrast to all his predecessors since Lenin, M.S. Gorbachev, who has the best chance of becoming president, would have to see to the creation of a civilized and constructive opposition to the CPSU and to himself. In the changing historical conditions this will in many ways determine his contribution to the new system's birth.

Of late there have been frequent references to presidential prerogatives in other countries, above all in the United States. But there is one graphic "detail" that one must not forget. President Bush is a Republican, but the Democrats have a majority in both houses of Congress. In the established U.S. democracy this is perfectly normal. Anyway, recent decades have provided more Republican presidents, but a preponderance of Democrats in Congress has been the rule rather than the exception, and this correlation of forces is created by the voter.

The mass media, which are commercial in nature, play a very important role, reflecting the positions of all the main participants in the political process and, at the same time, treasuring their own independence from authority. In accordance with the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Congress is not entitled to "issue a single law... restricting freedom of expression or of the press." No less than Congress or the Supreme Court, the media are a curb on potential abuses of executive authority.

Republican President Nixon resigned in the summer of 1974 when it was proved that he knew about illegal bugging operations (only bugging!) in the Democratic Party headquarters and sanctioned them. Another English word that sounds strange to our ears has come into the Russian language. Impeachment is the **procedure whereby Congress dismisses the president from his post for violating the law.** Anticipating impeachment, Nixon resigned—under strong pressure from various social forces and interests. In the eyes of the public, practically the main instigators of the anti-Nixon campaign were two young reporters from THE WASHINGTON POST, who received information from a secret source and freely published it in the columns of their influential newspaper. This is one illustration of American-style legal opposition and freedom of the press even at a time when the institution of the presidency was being strengthened, when it was called "imperial"—because Nixon and his predecessor Johnson had used their powers to wage war in Vietnam.

Of course, everything is relative. The independence of the American "big press" cannot be absolutized. It belongs to rich families or clans and cannot help looking at the world from the standpoint of their interests. Nevertheless, the breadth of information and spectrum of opinions represented in the press serve the interests of society on a broad level, not just the "official line." In conditions of tough competition, holding back information or unorthodox, frankly expressed opinions is **unprofitable**, apart from anything else. It hits your own pocket.

Your rival will make money out of the information that you kept secret, by bringing it to the reader or television viewer.

So there should be a strong (and democratic) president and a strong (and democratic) parliament. And a strong, independent press. This is also a condition of an efficient multiparty system. Political parties, groups, and movements should have extensive access to newspaper columns and television screens so that they can convey their opinions to society. We have something to learn in this regard too and we must learn it.

We are introducing the institution of the presidency as part of a new political system which does not yet fully exist. Therefore, it is even more important to have an idea of the landmarks and the distance of the road to the future on which our society has embarked.

Press Conference on Presidency, Yeltsin

LD1203162990 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The institution of an executive presidency in the Soviet Union was discussed at the extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, which opened today. It was one of the main topics at the first press conference.

Soviet Minister of Justice Veniamin Yakovlev, who addressed the press conference, described the institution of executive presidency as "a logical advance of society towards the creation of a law-governed state." He believes that the executive presidency "will help resolve the major economic and political problems facing society and help establish and protect civil rights and freedoms and develop democracy and glasnost."

He recalled that new legislative structures have begun to function in the Soviet Union, but "the executive power continues to be the weakest link." The institution of executive presidency, he continued, "will help strengthen and balance the three component parts of state power—the legislative, executive and judicial branches."

Journalists asked if the institution of executive presidency is connected with the coming abolition of Articles 6 and 7 of the Soviet Constitution which deal with the guiding role of the Soviet Communist Party. Answering this question, Sergey Stankevich, member of the Opposition Interregional Group, said that the connection was obvious. He recognised the feasibility of the institution of executive presidency, but he has some reservations over the actual election of the new head of state. He believes that in a multinational state, a president should be elected not at the congress, but by a nationwide vote.

Veniamin Yakovlev did not agree with Stankevich. He stressed that an acute political situation had formed in the country. In some regions the life and safety of people are in danger. "In these conditions any delay in the strengthening of executive power may have too high a price," he said.

Stankevich announced that the Interregional Group "decided not to nominate alternative candidates to the post of president." His statement refuted forecasts by some foreign mass media that Boris Yeltsin, co-chairman of the group, would be nominated by it as an alternative candidate.

Presidency Per Se Will Not Solve Problems

PM1303102590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

[E. Gonzalyez "Commentator's View": "Comrade President"]

[Text] That sounds unusual, of course. "Mr. President" is a different matter. But there are grounds for hoping that we will soon have a Comrade President. I would be so bold as to surmise that he will be Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev (the superstitious may knock on wood at this point).

Nevertheless, there were a few and therefore very sharp objections. On the first day of the extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies Valentin Alekseyevich Shuvalov, a resident of Zelenograd, declared a hunger strike in Moscow's Sverdlov Square. In protest at the election of the president by deputies alone.

There was a constant jostle of 15-20 people around the hunger striker. Some sympathized with the aim of the protest, others condemned it. But most passersby did not even stop at this busy spot. Probably people felt that this reaction was out of proportion with the upcoming event.

However, I think Valentin Alekseyevich is not the only person whose sense of proportion has let him down. In recent weeks all the mass media have devoted a lot of space to propaganda for presidential rule. Such massive and concerted persuasion of the people of something that the great mass had no intention of objecting to may still evoke a wave of overly high expectations. Getting carried away, we have somehow contrived to attribute almost all the West's achievements to the local presidents and to cleverly link our own problems with our lack of a president. So apparently we need only wait for the deputies to press at last their electronic buttons, look at the display panel, then take a look out the window—has a time of plenty already begun, or must we wait another 10 minutes or so?

To be serious, I certainly do not want in any way to belittle the importance of what is now taking place in the Kremlin. It is a major event! For the whole world, and for us to the nth degree. And moreover, an event that is ambiguous in its foreseeable consequences. There has been considerable conjecture on this score—at the Supreme Soviet session, in the press, among friends, and

in the family circle. Conjectures are continuing to be voiced from the Congress platform.

I am not going to rehash them—you can get the thoughts of the main speaker and any deputy from the horse's mouth, so to speak. But, in general terms, what are they talking about? In the first place, about what our president **is bound to do** (with a great degree of certainty). In the second, about what he **may do** in certain circumstances (with some degree of misgiving). But I would like to say at least a couple of words "in the third place": about what the president, **in my opinion, will be unable to do.**

One deputy spent a long time on the platform listing our problems, which everybody knows already. The shelves in the stores are empty, trade turnover is declining, basic necessities are not available, delivery discipline could not be worse, and so forth in similar vein. And he concluded: This is why we support the introduction of presidential rule.

Alas, this is yet another case of overly high expectations. It would be good if we all got it into our heads right now that no president is capable of supplying the people with goods, housing, excellent health, and money—even rubles, let alone convertible currency. The election of a president, alas, does not solve the problems. It is difficult even to describe it as the first action to solve them. It is rather another action to create conditions in which it will be possible to solve something. An action which we clearly cannot manage without between the adoption and the implementation of the government program and the laws on leasing, land, ownership, and all the rest. An essential action, but the question is: A sufficient one?

Even judging by the first speeches by deputies, it can be said that the path to the presidency will not be absolutely smooth. But is there anywhere, any country where the presidency is offered as a gift? It is always the result of political struggle.

Pros, Cons of Presidential System Discussed

90UN1080A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No. 9, 3-9 Mar 90 pp 1-2

[Statements by Doctor of Philosophy V. Khalipov and Doctor of Legal Sciences B. Kurashvili on the proposed presidential system: "USSR President: Points of View"]

[Text] Following a stormy debate, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the decree "On Establishing the Office of the USSR President and Amending the USSR Constitution (Main Law) Correspondingly." The draft law will be considered by the extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies which will be convened on 12 March of this year. Doctor of Philosophy V. Khalipov and Doctor of Legal Sciences B. Kurashvili state their views of the presidency in our country.

V. Khalipov: "Look Before You Leap"

In October 1917, our state was created as the Republic of Soviets from the bottom to the top. This was the concept of Lenin, the concept of the party, and an expression of the political aspirations of the masses. It seemed that a correct alternative had been found to the forms of social structures and state administration known throughout history. However, although decades have passed the idea turns out not to have been actually implemented. It was set back by the times of Stalinism and Brezhnevism; it was crushed by the command administrative system.

This is why many people began to discuss enthusiastically the need to finally implement the slogan "All power to the soviets!," while initiating perestroyka, bringing back to life everything progressive in socialist thought and practice, and learning the lessons of the past.

However, without completing this, we resolved to embark on another large-scale political endeavor, the introduction of presidential rule. This is a major issue, an issue of principle. It cannot be resolved without looking hard and discussing it in earnest.

It is clear to all of us who is envisaged in the office of the president at present. Many people believe for a good reason that the leader of our perestroyka deserves this position. However, the office is going to be introduced in earnest and for the long term rather than for 10 or 15 years.

First, we are, of course, attracted by Western practices, an opportunity for our leaders to communicate with foreign leaders with the appropriate title, all the more so because at present the party title and the party do not look as they used to. However, we cannot fail to see that the experience of political practice and established democratic procedures abroad is versatile whereas our experience is different and meager.

Second, what are we to do about the soviets themselves? After all, we have not yet lived to see either a federation or strong and wise soviets. Will we be acting deliberately if, having taken the very first steps in transferring power to them, we restrict them again? The president of the country himself is not the issue here. Very shortly, the analogous issue of introducing the presidency in a number of union republics if not in all of them will arise. However, how is this system going to be combined with the concept of the Union of Soviet, rather than presidential, republics? Could a strong republic presidency become an argument in favor of a confederation rather than a federation?

Third, what is to be done about our Communist Party which is going through a critical period in its development? How is it to structure its relationship with the president? Should it delegate the president from its ranks and control him, and will he allow the party to do this?

The following issue also needs to be considered in the long term: Should the president retain his post as first

leader of the party or, in the name of independence, suspend his membership temporarily for the duration of his presidential term under the conditions of a multiparty system? Furthermore, in light of the forthcoming heyday of political pluralism, will it not become necessary to hand over the presidency to a representative of alternative or opposition parties? Could one of such subsequent presidents be tempted to press the communists hard in political life or altogether exclude them from it?

Finally, is it worthwhile to overload one person with power? Indeed, one gets the impression that we are having difficulty avoiding the temptation to place the entire burden on the one who works.

We may assume that the idea of the presidency will get the upper hand. However, the country needs a president who is accountable to the people, not just a president with enormous powers, not just a president with authority comparable to that of the Supreme Soviet. This is why this issue should be resolved within the framework of the overall system of problems associated with creating a new constitution in a manner such that the country, socialism, and perestroyka win.

B. Kurashvili: "May the Presidency Save Us"

The president is the head of state who unifies the activities of three systems of power within the confines strictly set forth in the law and the head of the administrative system. He is accountable to the Congress and the Supreme Soviet. The laws and other decisions made by the representatives of the people are binding on the president as well.

However, he has procedural powers with regard to the representatives of the people: the right of a suspension veto which may be overridden by a qualified majority of the people's representatives and the right to schedule a referendum on the most significant and controversial issues even if the people's representatives object to this.

The president acts in his capacity as the head of the administrative system both directly and through his administrative "alter ego," the chairman of the government, proposed by him and confirmed by the Supreme Soviet.

The powers of the president with regard to union republics consist of what the republics delegate to him out of their sovereignty by virtue of the union treaty expressed in the USSR Constitution. The president heads two councils: the presidential council, consisting of the presidents of union republics, and the supreme military council (in the long term, it will apparently be the security council). The president makes decisions on certain issues on his own in the event of urgent necessity (repulsing a military attack, introducing a state of emergency) subsequently submitting these decisions for approval to the Supreme Soviet.

In a word, the powers of the president are extensive but necessary. The moral and political authority of this office will increase still more when it is filled by nationwide elections. Certainly, the authority of the office cannot make up for the flaws of the mind and character of the office holder. These flaws are only exacerbated by power. This is why it is extremely important not to make a mistake in the course of electing the president and to control him throughout his activities.

These two tasks may be accomplished with maximum guarantees possible only in the environment of a multiparty system where factions of the ruling and opposition parties exist in a fully-empowered permanent parliament and the rights of a minority are ensured.

We do not yet have this, and for this reason setting up the office of the president entails great risk. The degeneration of the democratic institution of the presidency into dictatorial power is not ruled out. Still, the risk is justified under current conditions, now that the process of "sovietization of power," its transition from the party committees to the state organs has brought about the abrupt weakening of power due to the mistakes made. At the same time, measures aimed at reducing this risk should be taken right now.

Normally, the leader of the majority party will be president. However, at present we have just one party. The president who is at the same time the leader of this party may use it to make his power authoritarian. It means that the future president should immediately abandon his leadership positions in the party, including his Central Committee membership.

In the immediate future, the emergence of three parties with a socialist orientation is possible. Using the words "left" and "right" in the generally accepted sense (in our country, it is "the other way around), these are, perhaps, going to be: the left party of "organized socialism" which will retain the name "communist," the center-left party of democratic socialism whose goal will be to make transform socialism on the basis of extensive commercial production with the exclusion of private capitalist enterprise, and the center- right social-democratic party which will bank on allowing private capitalist enterprise on a considerable scale.

M.S. Gorbachev has the best chances of becoming president. Despite the failures of perestroyka, his authority endures. To be sure, he has voiced a number of times the idea of development without models and patterns. This is how perestroyka has proceeded—without models and patterns. Putting it bluntly, such an idea is useless for the leader of the party which is supposed to be "on the lookout," but it is not all that important for the president, the head of executive power.

May the presidency save us.

Yeltsin on Presidency, Economic Reform

90UN1080B Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 9, 3-9 Mar 90 pp 4-5

[Report on interview with Boris Yeltsin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondents P. Lukyanchenko and A. Binev at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet: "I Am Optimistic Nonetheless"; date not specified]

[Text] The beginning of the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet turned out to be stormy. During a break in the proceedings, our correspondents P. Lukyanchenko and A. Binev talked with B. Yeltsin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Last year, you came up with the concept of presidential rule in our country yourself; now you are attaching such conditions to it that, in the opinion of M.S. Gorbachev, the presidency begins to make no sense.

[Yeltsin] I am in favor of the presidency provided, however, that very serious preparations are made for it.

After all, as of now it is unknown what he is to preside over. To begin with, the issue of the state structure of the USSR needs to be resolved. We should adopt a law on separating the functions of the center and the republics and give the latter the maximum independence possible, that is, embark on a path of decentralizing power and decentralizing the economy because it is exactly the monopoly, the super-concentration of power and the economy that have brought our country to its present condition. We should ensure that there are strong republics which should decide themselves which functions are to be given to the president and which are to be retained. It is not only premature but also dangerous to introduce the presidency until there is a union treaty, a treaty of the union republics.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Are you hinting that this will lead to a dictatorship?

[Yeltsin] Not only that. Legislative power should be reinforced by no less a margin than that of the president before the presidency is introduced. Incidentally, many deputies have mentioned this. Looking a little bit ahead, I come to the conclusion that under our current circumstances the system of the presidency will not bring about an abrupt improvement in the economy, stabilization of the situation, and establishment of order in our country.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] However, the country is in a particularly grave condition, and radical measures should be taken right now in order to improve the situation fundamentally. Meanwhile, you are saying that we should postpone this.... Perhaps, the presidency will be a panacea for all our troubles.

[Yeltsin] It is not a panacea but a very grave mistake. I believe that the chairman of the Supreme Soviet should act more decisively within the framework of the powers which he has and does not exercise completely. Five years of indecision, half-measures, and compromises have brought the country to where it is.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] However, in his speeches M.S. Gorbachev has admitted honestly and frankly that mistakes have indeed been made in the course of perestroyka....

[Yeltsin] Please understand that I am not against perestroyka. On the contrary, I have supported and I do support Gorbachev in terms of strategy. I mean the ultimate goals of perestroyka as the renewal of all spheres of life of our society. However, from the very beginning there has been no comprehensive perestroyka strategy.

I proposed to implement a political reform first and then proceed to an economic reform. However, prior to this the package of economic laws was to be created which is only now taking shape: The law on land, the law on property, the law on taxation, the law on local self-government, and so on. We rushed toward the economic reform without this foundation... and to this day one mistake has come after the other.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] What do you want to say by this?

[Yeltsin] They might rebuke me for getting on my "bandwagon" again—I mean privileges. The question is: What good is the Primakov commission? Why shouldn't we just cancel all the privileges right away so as not to irritate the people needlessly? It would be better to introduce two or three privileges by some law later. Meanwhile, what is the commission doing? They are trying to determine whether a personal plane is a privilege or not.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Who gets to use personal planes in our country?

[Yeltsin] All Politburo members, candidate members of the Politburo, and secretaries of the Central Committee. Members of the Politburo fly on the IL-62's, and candidates and secretaries on the TU-134's. They even have special Aviation Detachment No 235 in the Ministry of Civil Aviation for this purpose. Millions are spent for this purpose from the state budget. Who confirms these expenditures? The Supreme Soviet? Of course not. They don't let it go anywhere close to this. So, a Central Committee secretary flies on such a plane alone with five guards.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] However, the U.S. President also has his personal plane!

[Yeltsin] Certainly. A president is what he is. Our Soviet president should also have this privilege as the symbol of state, symbol of the nation.

Let us look at the "dacha" issue. Nobody would have anything against it if our leaders built personal dachas spending their personal funds.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] However, as far as we know, Politburo members are not allowed to have their own dachas. They say that this rule applies to the entire Central Committee apparatus.

[Yeltsin] Yes, because you get to pay for your own dacha from your own pocket. In this case, everything is free, hence "the ban."

Look, for example, at the anti-alcohol ukase. Much harm was done, and many vineyards were destroyed! This is to say nothing about the 20 brand-new sets of brewery equipment produced in Czechoslovakia which were junked. To be sure, this was the idea of Ligachev and Solomentsev. However, why didn't Gorbachev reject it?

We have delayed the reform of the finance and credit system for too long. At the sessions and congresses, all kinds of decisions have been made but not this one. We have embarked on the "job" but have turned out not to be equal to it. We have deviated from the agenda all the time, and the most significant points have been left out of the congresses and sessions.

Here is a very fresh "mistake of perestroyka": Building the economic reform on the concept of one economist, Abalkin in this case. One person, even if the most talented, may make a small mistake. However, this mistake multiplied by 280 millions of our citizens turns into 280 million mistakes. I mean his notorious three percent cap on the growth of the remuneration fund. The enterprises have found a way to circumvent this: They have set up their own cooperatives into which they pump money. As a result, wages have increased by 13 percent but the stocks of goods have not increased. Why should we not assemble the supreme economic minds of our country?

This is to say nothing about increasing the wages of the party apparatus by a factor of 1.5 to 2. In Sverdlovsk, I discussed this topic in particular. I met with the apparatus of the city committee of the party. Do you know what they told me? "To be sure, it is nice to have your salary raised. However, this was not done at a proper time. They put us in an extremely difficult position. We come to a plant and want to speak to the workers, but they turn their backs on us: 'We work our tails off, and the wages increase by R2 a year. Meanwhile, you got as much as a hundred.'" This is the gravest tactical mistake!

I also have complaints to make about M.S. Gorbachev in his capacity as chairman of the Supreme Soviet. He has been given a lot of deputy inquiries, and answers to quite a few have not been received. They have somehow disappeared without a trace. This, after all, is a violation of the law which he personally adopted, among others, and he should be the first to demand that it be complied with. Look at how the chair has treated the deputies of the interregional group! "You are pushing," "you are smuggling in," "I know who is behind this," "this is demagoguery," "this is opposition," "they struggle for power." There is no way to call this friendly.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] What has been happening with three commissions for your case, two under the Central Committee and one under the Supreme Soviet?

[Yeltsin] I know next to nothing. I only know that the Supreme Soviet commission has failed to arrive at an unambiguous conclusion, and its findings have been referred for additional work. At present, a new campaign of persecution is under way. Before I flew to Japan, I was handed a note "by chance": "The plane you are on will crash." Yesterday, I found out that the memoirs of the chief of the Administration of the KGB for Sverdlovsk Oblast concerning my work as first secretary of the obkom [oblast party committee] are being prepared "on orders from the top."

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] My final question is: What are your predictions for the coming half-year?

[Yeltsin] M.S. Gorbachev should take a step forward and at the very least one step left. He should take more resolute measures than he has in all of these five years. I am optimistic nonetheless, and I hope that the situation will improve and the Romanian scenario will not be repeated in our country. I also hope that the army will be prudent: It should not be drawn into a conflict. They also understand this because political processes have affected them too.

Yeltsin Criticizes 'Half-Hearted' Reforms

AU0903193890 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 9 Mar 90 p 10

[Interview with USSR Supreme Soviet deputy Boris Yeltsin by Josef Riedmiller; date and place not given]

[Text] [Riedmiller] Mr. Yeltsin, formerly you were a close aide of Mikhail Gorbachev. What is the real reason for your quarrel with the party-state leader?

[Yeltsin] This is not a quarrel. We have different positions and different views on the tactic of perestroyka, and we have different views on the processes within the party. I can, of course, not accept the idea that no changes have been made within these five years, that no renewal has taken place, and that no reform has been carried out within the Army and KGB. Of course, measures have been taken, but they are not resolute enough. They are half-hearted measures. In addition, nobody can predict the mood among the people, nor do we know when this mood will reach a critical point.

[Riedmiller] You say very often that Gorbachev does not have much time to solve the USSR's problems. What would happen if he fails? Would glasnost and perestroyka continue to exist nevertheless?

[Yeltsin] No, the people would take to the streets and would take their fate in their own hands, as the people in Eastern Europe have done. However, I do not think there will be a military coup. Nor do I believe that the apparatus will stage a coup. I cannot imagine such a thing. I think it is totally impossible. I know the interior

of this whole kitchen very well. I was a Politburo member for two-and-a-half years myself.

[Riedmiller] People in the West as well as in the Soviet Union often say that the Soviet people are not ripe for democracy, and that the authoritarian state form is better for them. Judging by your experiences in two election campaigns and your work in the Supreme Soviet, do you think that the parliamentary system in the Soviet Union is already firmly anchored?

[Yeltsin] No, you are right.

[Riedmiller] You have accused Gorbachev of constantly vacillating between the radical reformers, including yourself, and the dogmatists within the party. What should he do to push perestroyka? Does he have a chance to defeat the traditionalists within the party?

[Yeltsin] He should replace the half-hearted measures by radical measures; he must oust these extreme rightists from the Politburo—people such as Ligachov, Ryzhkov, and others. He must think about whether he wants to be supported by the people or by the apparatus. He prescribed a salary increase for the apparatus and has thereby hit himself. That means it looked as if he had decided to rely on the apparatus. This apparatus has always saved itself, and it will continue to save itself. However, the people will sweep the apparatus away. Relying on the support from the people, instead of the apparatus, cannot be wrong.

[Riedmiller] Will the next party congress be able to get rid of the extreme rightists?

[Yeltsin] That is not possible in your country, and it is not possible in our country either. Yet one could make sure that the key positions not be held by conservatives. That would be possible. However, to do so, Gorbachev would have to show resolve, which so far he has not been doing sufficiently.

[Riedmiller] Almost all former socialist countries have been trying to change from the centralized command economy to market economy, but have not been successful. Do you have a master plan?

[Yeltsin] That is an interesting question. When the government submitted its program for shoring up the economy at the second session of the Congress of People's Deputies, I rejected it and voted against it. I think a decisive disadvantage of this program is the fact that it fails to state by which mechanism the transition is supposed to come about. The absence of such a mechanism will lead to chaos.

In my view, one of the elements of this mechanism would be a system of convertible money. The situation is paradoxical. We have three types of money now. They only have that in China. There is a ruble for the people; there is the wooden ruble for enterprises, for which you cannot buy anything; and there is hard currency. If enterprises had a cash account, they would have a much larger interest in supplying the market with foodstuffs and other products. That would equalize the unbalanced situation of money supply on the one hand, and the existing goods supply on the other.

The proposal made by (Vice Premier and economist—SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG) Abalkin to decrease salaries and wages and thereby reduce the existing money supply, is a gross mistake. It will cost him his office. He wanted to limit the salaries to a growth rate of three percent. Nonetheless, the enterprises have managed to form cooperatives in their areas, and to increase payments by as much as 13 percent last year, without the goods supply having increased.

This transition to cash accounts should take place step by step. It should consist of the following elements: First, selling the products that have been produced in excess of the state orders, on the free market. The money for these products would be received in cash. Second, selling consumer goods. Third, the money for these goods would again have to be received in cash and would have to be paid to accounts from which the salaries would be paid as well as the services to the ministry. So the latter would not be paid from the state budget.

Then every worker, every master, and every director would be careful. If we bought a machine-tool for 50,000 Deutsche marks and paid it from this account, we would know that we bought this machine and would therefore get a correspondingly lower wage. We have thousands of machines which have been standing around for years; some of them have not even been unpacked, and have not been used. However, the machines that are bought for cash would be put into operation within a few days, because they are supposed to help increase production, and more money is expected to come from this production, so that it will pay off.

With our stupid system, enterprises are unable to buy furniture for a kindergarten. They cannot buy a television set, because all this can only be bought for cash, and nothing can be bought from deposit money. If they got cash, the enterprises would also have an immense interest in producing consumer goods. The money for these goods would immediately go into this circulation system.

Then the "unbalanced situation" which I mentioned earlier would also be equalized in the direction of more goods. That is one point. On the other hand, this would also enlarge the market, because first, the money would allow the enterprises to sell their production, and second, it would allow them to make purchases from the proceeds—they could, for instance, buy television sets or furniture for children from enterprises that have also an interest in selling their products for cash.

That is one of the elements which I think are quite interesting. In addition, I think we have a totally wrong system. Whenever a new leader comes, he develops a new economic system which is solely based on the idea of a single man. Aganbegyan and Abalkin are a case in point. Everybody makes mistakes somewhere. However,

the mistakes of a single person, multiplied by 280 million heads of our population, amount to 280 million mistakes.

The economy of such a country must not be based on the theory of a single man. We must set up a huge "think tank" of economic scientists of very different persuasions and ideas to develop—on the basis of this collective intellect—the most perfect solutions possible.

[Riedmiller] You have been a member of the Communist Party for 30 years. You have been a CPSU official for many years. When and why did you begin to have doubts about the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist idea?

[Yeltsin] I am neither an official nor an apparatchik. I started as a worker and worked my way up step by step on the official ladder within 14 years, reaching the position of the head of a large combine with 20,000 employees. That means that I am primarily a man from the production sector. I have contacts with the people; I understand the people and the common man. I know how to work with the people. I developed this ability during that time, not during the time when I worked in the party. That was the first socialization. To that extent, you can by no means say that I am a pure official. That is one thing.

Second, you addressed my doubts about Marxism-Leninism and my rejection of Marxism-Leninism. This is not correct. I only reject some dogmas, such as the principle of democratic centralism. I think that it is obsolete and wrong. It is a very important principle for the party. However, this principle brings me into an absolutely stupid situation. I have a principled opinion as a USSR people's deputy. I will say so at the congress. Before that, we will have a Central Committee plenary meeting, and then I will be told that I must say it differently, and that I must carry out the Central Committee orders. What am I to do? Should I obey my conscience, or should I observe discipline and an obsolete principle which basically does not admit different opinions and groups?

Yeltsin Predicts 'Popular Uprising' in USSR

AU0903134590 Rome ANSA in English 1218 GMT 9 Mar 90

[Excerpt] (ANSA) Milan, March 9—If the Soviet Union, and in particular its leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, does not adopt urgent and radical measures, there could be a popular uprising even before the end of this year, according to Soviet radical reformist Boris Yeltsin, in an interview appearing in today's edition of the Milan daily IL CORRIERE DELLA SERA.

In the course of the interview, Yeltsin, who the Italian press has dubbed the "kamakaze of perestroyka," denied that his final aim was that of replacing Gorbachev at the helm of the Soviet Union. "My aim is not to kick him out and take his place," Yeltsin affirmed, adding "Gorbachev wants to be elected by the Congress of Peoples Deputies and not by the people and this is a method I do not approve of and will oppose."

The radical politician then went on to add: "This could change the day in which the president is elected by universal suffrage, perhaps in four years or perhaps even in a year. This because if Gorbachev does not change course his substitution will become necessary."

In a harsh judgement of Gorbachev's performance, Yeltsin affirmed that had the Kremlin leader freed himself of the influence of conservative communist forces "the situation today would be much different and no one would even consider a change at the top."

"Instead," he added, "Gorbachev continues to appear insecure, uncertain over what path to follow because of conservative pressure... When one says Gorbachev is a cautious and far-seeing politician they are being foolish. The facts show that he is hesitant and conditioned."

Asked what he would do in the next six months if he were Gorbachev, Yeltsin preferred to say what he would have done in the past three or four years, affirming that the present crisis in the Soviet Union is a direct result of the delays accumulated in the recent past.

"The law to reorganise the state has not been passed," he said, "and this has sparked nationalist and separatist tensions. No pan- Soviet pact has even been prepared which guarantees decentralisation and recognises the national dignity of the republics, and yet Gorbachev knew this was of priority importance. There has been no reform within the (Communist) Party and now as we are set to do this the party has already lost its prestige and credibility. We must give up democratic centralism... And then tackle the economy. Economic reform has been dealt with Krushchev-style and it ends up the same way, in nothingness, just like Khrushchev's reforms."

Asked whether there was the risk that Gorbachev would suffer the same fate as Khrushchev, Yeltsin affirmed this was not possible because "given the situation today, I see no possibility of a plot in the palace. I believe, on the other hand, in a popular explosion, a spontaneous revolt which with each day becomes more probable. The people's living standards have gotten worse in the past years and if urgent and radical measures are not adopted then the people will take to the streets. I would say even before the end of this year." [passage omitted]

Yakovlev Says Gorbachev 'Free From Ambition'

LD1303121690 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 13 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev "is free from ambition. Moreover, he sometimes feels it as a burden," Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev believes.

In an interview published by the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper today, Yakovlev recalled that Gorbachev originally opposed the presidency in the belief that such form of rule does not conform to Soviet traditions.

"However, gradually Gorbachev arrived at a conclusion that a consolidating force was really needed in our multi-ethnic state which is both rich and neglected," Yakovlev said.

"It is not to him personally that power is needed and it was not for himself that he meant it. This is why he insisted and secured that the election of an executive president be held exclusively on an alternative basis.

"If he is not elected—well, that will be the judgement of history and the bells of fate will begin to strike differently. Although I personally believe that the country has no other person capable of uniting all forces at this crucial stage, Yakovlev remarked.

"The presidency is a form of government which is utterly new to our country and which will consolidate the multi-ethnic state, which is of extreme importance to the Soviet Union," Yakovlev emphasised.

"Political forces in the country are regrouping under the conditions of the change of people's psychology and of all our old habits and attitudes towards democracy, freedom, personality, the economy and social life.

"In this situation a democratic country is in need of a unifying authority. Decentralisation should be combined with the stabilisation of society," Yakovlev said.

Yakovlev Denies Gorbachev 'Hungry for Power'

PM1303002390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Mar 90 p3

[Interview with A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by Leningrad Journalists' Organization newspaper CHAS PIK correspondent A. Gronov: "Is Gorbachev Hungry for Power?"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] [Gronov] So the way to a presidency is open, and now it depends solely on the Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies whether we follow this path. It is clear that there will be opponents, one of whose arguments was already voiced at the Supreme Soviet session: The post of president in a country with its historical traditions of conclaves and citizens' assemblies contradicts the national spirit.

[Yakovlev] I am not a supporter of historical analogies, although I am sometimes guilty of resorting to them. In this instance we should not proceed from our history. For us a presidency is a totally new form of rule consolidating the multinational state, which is exceptionally important for the USSR. Consolidating in a democratic context, not an authoritarian or monarchic context.

We are currently in a complex period. And although changes are being implemented by political, peaceful means, the increase in sharpness is tantamount to revolutionary. Here I am talking about the sharpness not only in the clash of opinions and the diverse views heard at rallies, but also inside our own heads. We have all developed split personalities. One part of every person's mind is in favor of what is happening, while another part is against.

I don't really believe those who assert that they are completely in favor of perestroyka or absolutely against. Nothing is that simple; everything is much more complex. When some kind of revolutionary change is happening inside our heads it is extremely important to understand the need for a new path.

In my view the objections of the opponents of a presidency stem primarily from an examination of the consequences of the first step. But it is essential to calculate the second, third, and fourth steps, each of which will bring adjustments of its own. We are witnessing a regrouping of political forces in conditions of a change in people's mentality, in all our old habits, in attitudes to democracy, freedom, the individual, the economy, social life. In this situation, if we analyze things further, a democratic country needs a consolidating authority. And when we talk about decentralization it should be borne in mind that it must be combined with the stabilization of society.

[Gronov] Does it not seem to you that unpredictable consequences could arise with the introduction of presidential rule? After all the USSR does not have the experience of democratic institutions that usually go with a presidential system.

[Yakovlev] Who says that this experience could exist today? Who will say that it will be accumulated tomorrow? This is a continuous process, after all. But if we are going to wait for the adoption of a collection of essential laws, for every person's consciousness to mature, for crime, the shadow economy, and lawlessness to be eliminated, for everybody to start loving one another, then no president would be needed. But the emergence of a president today is also a means for turning society onto the democratic path.

[Gronov] The current turnaround also alarms many people for the reason that given our virtually total lack of political culture new abuses could emerge and presidential rule could gradually be reduced to a new tyranny, to put it crudely.

[Yakovlev] This is precisely why we also need a strong Supreme Soviet as a counterbalance to any attempts, from any source, to weaken democratic practices. But, incidentally, a threat (let us describe it as right-wing, for

example) can exist irrespective of whether there is a president or not. This depends on the correlation of social forces, moods, the economic situation, political views, and also our old friend political culture, whose level is indeed low in our country at present. And how could it be anything else? After all, for a thousand years we have been ruled by people rather than laws. This thousand-year paradigm now needs to be demolished. And this demolition has now begun. Whether it succeeds depends both on the people and on the forum where they meet.

As yet we cannot say that we are operating ideally in terms of consolidating the democratic foundations. I, for example, am very concerned at the way we treat the head of state. In no civilized state is it the case that everybody considers it necessary to "kick" him. But why does it happen in our country? Because he is not head of state but an ordinary presiding officer, whose function everywhere is to be the target for everybody's whims and dissatisfactions. How can our head [of state] effectively lead the country when God knows what is rained down on him in a single day in the chair in such an overexcited hall?

[Gronov] When talking about a president most people have Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev primarily in mind. But what is his personal position?

[Yakovlev] Whereas I favored presidential rule from the start, he was against it. He considers that this form of rule does not accord with Soviet traditions. But he gradually came to the conclusion that in our simultaneously rich and impoverished multinational state a consolidating force is indeed necessary. He personally does not need power; he has not tried to line himself up for it. This is why he insisted—and he got his way—that elections for president must be conducted on a competitive basis. If he is not elected, that will be how history will ordain it, and the bells of destiny will toll differently. Although I personally believe that at present there is no other person in the country capable of uniting all forces at this most acute stage. No matter what anyone says, that is the reality.

[Gronov] In short, you believe that a personal motive is totally out of the question.

[Yakovlev] Incontrovertibly. If Mikhail Sergeyevich had sought to strengthen his personal power he would not have done what he has been doing these past four years. Given that, I would reject the slightest suspicion.

[Gronov] What would be your reply to people who hold a different view—that Gorbachev is hungry for unlimited power?

[Yakovlev] That, to put it mildly, they are wrong. He is devoid of any aspiration for power. Moreover, sometimes it is a burden to him. Remember that he is sometimes accused of timidity [polvinchatost]. But if you analyze where precisely this so-called timidity is demonstrated, it is in deciding people's fates, the people's fate. Here he does indeed hesitate, because it is lives that are at stake. And I believe that God will forgive him this hesitation.

[Gronov] And obviously shows of emotion reflect not the head of state, but a man who feels and suffers acutely....

[Yakovlev] If he was some hardened politician he would sometimes simply not react so acutely to attacks. But he is a man, not a robot. Paradoxical as it may seem, this is something that must be cherished. He is a politician, a major politician, and he has never indulged in politicking.

[Gronov] At the session the question was asked: Is it so extremely essential today to be concerned about a presidency when so many highly important problems have accumulated?

[Yakovlev] Today executive power is manifestly sick. This is yet another reason for the speediest introduction of presidential rule.

Lukyanov Views Congress Session on Presidency

LD1003180190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 10 Mar 90

[Interview with Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by special correspondent Igor Zorin, in Moscow on 10 March—live or recorded]

[Text] On the first day of the registration of USSR people's deputies in the Georgiyevskiy Hall in the Kremlin, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, USSR people's deputy and first deputy chairman of our country's Supreme Soviet, has registered himself. The congress, the third, an extraordinary one, is being convened because of a single, but very global, issue.

How would you summarize those proposals and letters which have been arriving at the USSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the establishment of the post of our country's president?

[Lukyanov] I think more will be involved than just the ratification of the post of president. The point is that the Supreme Soviet adopted a law on ownership at its last session. Before this, a law on land was adopted. Thus, it will be necessary at the Congress to introduce amendments to the Constitution on issues of ownership. This means four very major paragraphs in the section on the USSR's economic basis. This law is of very substantial importance, and therefore the issues studied by the Congress will be broader than simply the establishment of the post of president and the selection of the USSR's president.

At present, we are receiving—especially after publication of the draft law for discussion by the whole people—we are receiving many proposals. Whole collectives are

expressing themselves. Public organizations are expressing themselves. I can only say that an analysis of these proposals and letters demonstrates that the majority—I would even say the vast majority—are expressing themselves in support of these proposals on the introduction of the post of president, regarding the president as a guarantor of the strengthening of power, a guarantor of stability in our society, and a guarantor of the development and filling of the Soviet federation with new content. Therefore, there are many proposals, but the proposals are basically positive.

There are also, of course, proposals either concerned with amendments to the draft law or denying the necessity of carrying out this great step now. Well, there are few—comparitively few—such proposals. The country is enormous; therefore there is a wide range of opinions. But, basically, I think that the opinion of the Supreme Soviet, when it adopted the draft law and approved this draft law on the introduction of the post of president of the USSR, was not at odds with the opinion of the majority of the Soviet population.

[Zorin] Anatoliy Ivanovich, many people say that we have the U.S. presidential version, or the French one. Some say both. But what do you think? What has been taken as a basis?

[Lukyanov] I think that we will have the Soviet version of a president. Presidential power, the post of president with his power, will be inserted into the Soviet system, into the republic of soviets. We do not intend to cede the power of the soviets, which consists of the power of the people.

[Zorin] Anatoliy Ivanovich, you said—perhaps it was a slip of the tongue, or perhaps it was an intentional slip—that we will have presidential power. Do you consider this issue resolved on the eve of the Congress?

[Lukyanov] No, this is to be resolved by the Congress, to be thoroughly discussed by the Congress, and only the decision of the Congress will mean that we have arrived at this very important institution in our state. I hope that the Congress will discuss it thoroughly and adopt that decision which will correspond to the will of the Soviet people.

[Zorin] How many days is the Third Congress planned for?

[Lukyanov] Well, this will be decided by the Congress itself. At least, I think, not less than three days.

BBC TV Interviews Abalkin, Akhromeyev, Stankevich

PM0703161090

[Editorial Report] London BBC Television Network in English at 2230 GMT on 6 March, carries interviews with Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Leonid Abalkin and Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief military adviser to President Gorbachev, in Russian with English subtitles, and People's Deputy Sergey Stankevich in English by news presenter Peter Snow in Moscow on BBC 2 "Newsnight."

At the Supreme Soviet yesterday, following his speech on the draft law on private ownership in the Supreme Soviet, Abalkin tells Snow: "The economic situation is very complicated, and unfortunately over the last few months it hasn't improved but got worse. Go round Moscow; there are shops which everyone describes simply as 'the empty shops'—the shelves are empty. But then you can go to the market, our peasant market. Go in there, and you'll find everything—meat, milk, fresh vegetables, fruit, flowers—everything that our earth can produce, but at prices three or five times the state ones. Two months in a row, in January and February, the level of industrial production fell: It fell by one percent, both in January and February. That's considered to be a very serious indicator of a crisis, but if you take a closer look, then in these same two months the production of consumer goods, including those produced by the military sector, rose by five to six percent. So maybe that one percent decline isn't so frightening if you put it alongside the drop in coal production and reductions in the military sector, which we want to cut anyway." Snow asks him: "When you say the economic situation is very, very serious, are you also one of those who believes that it could lead to social unrest? We've heard that from many people over the past week." Abalkin answers: "You mean, to even greater social unrest—because there's already a lot of social unrest in the country. This manifests itself in what you might call a crisis of trust: Trust in the government, and also, I should say, in our parliament, which comes in for very serious criticism, because people say there's a lot of talk but little action and little decisiveness. And that criticism is justified: The tension has become very great."

Snow reports on a poll on Soviet attitudes commissioned jointly by "Newsnight" and THE GUARDIAN and conducted by the Moscow Institute of Sociology, in which 3,000 people in six cities—Leningrad, Moscow, Tallinn, Irkutsk, and Alma-Ata—were interviewed. When asked about Soviet troops in Eastern Europe, 59 percent of those surveyed said all Soviet troops in Eastern Europe should come home. Snow puts this finding to Marshal Akhromeyev, who tells him: "The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe should be carried out in accordance with the relevant treaties drawn up with the countries concerned. And there's a special question regarding the troops that are stationed in East Germany: That's to do with the outcome of the Second World War."

Following a report on the fight for independence in Soviet Georgia, Peter Snow interviews USSR People's Deputy Sergey Stankevich, in the Moscow studio. The following is a text of the discussion:

[Snow] And I'm joined now by Sergey Stankevich, who's a radical deputy in the Soviet parliament and who sat on

the commission that investigated the Army's conduct in Georgia. Mr. Stankevich, the Georgians want independence; the Soviet people—according to our opinion poll—appear ready to give the republics that want them independence. Do you think that now has to happen?

[Stankevich] Yes, I think so. I think that we should work out the constitutional mechanism of liberating all the republics that would like to go out of the union, and if we have the clearly expressed will of the people in any republic—say, by referenda—if they would like to secede, let them go.

[Snow] And you'd have no truck, then, with Mr. Gorbachev's proposed five-year transition period?

[Stankevich] I don't think that we can keep all the republics during this transitional period by force. I think that we should act immediately.

[Snow] Now, you heard Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin talking of a lot of social unrest because of the economic problems in this country. Do you think this could be a serious threat to the government?

[Stankevich] I think, yes, if we have no real changes in our economy in the nearest future—say in the course of one year. I think that it's time to introduce all forms of property into our economy, and all forms of property in conditions of equal economic competition.

[Snow] Do you think part of the reason that Mr. Gorbachev is asking for these wide powers next week is to control possible unrest as he pushes through his economic reforms?

[Stankevich] Yes, I think so. I personally believe for Gorbachev: I think that he can use all these powers to accelerate the perestroyka. But the only reason for us to worry about the presidency is that we have no clearly expressed view of our republics. Let us consult with these republics, and after that introduce the presidency.

[Snow] Then you'll accept a strong presidency?

[Snow] Yes, I think so.

PRAVDA Views Five Years of Perestroyka

PM1003190190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "From Spring 1985 to Spring 1990"]

[Text] Today, in the first days of spring, a CPSU Central Committee plenum opens which will decide the dates for convening the 28th CPSU Congress and holding the report and election campaign in the party and the representation norms and procedure for electing congress delegates. It will also pronounce on issues that are crucial to the party—the CPSU's place in the political system and the draft new party statutes.

As it so happens, this Central Committee plenum is meeting exactly five years after the memorable extraordinary spring plenum in March 1985 which entrusted to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev the difficult and onerous duties of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

We have become accustomed to measuring our deeds in 5-year periods and linking both analysis of achievements and reflection on the future to these milestones. This is not merely a formal gesture, not an empty jubilee, but fills a need for a rigorous and objective assessment of what has been done and what remains undone, a need once again to check our chosen course against the economic and political realities and map out our future route along the path of perestroyka.

The concept and policy of perestroyka—the radical, revolutionary transformation of our entire society—did not emerge at once, overnight. Back in spring 1985 it was scarcely possible to discern the entire path that lay ahead, with its ups and downs and sharp bends, and prudently set out markers at the dangerous places. That is why the current criticism of the initiators of perestroyka for not having had a prearranged plan divided into clear stages sounds so naive. If you ask the critics what they could have offered society five years ago, or merely reread the speeches they made then, it is obvious that such opinions are inappropriate. The country could not wait, urgent practical steps were needed to get society out of the crisis we had sunk into during the stagnation period. The new leadership shouldered a burden whose weight was difficult to determine right away. The gravity of the economic problems and the neglect of the social sphere gradually became apparent and society's spiritual crisis was revealed. But it would have been utterly immoral to avoid searching for a solution—even an imperfect one—to the urgent questions, and it was impossible to sit back and wait for the optimum ideas for the requisite changes to emerge. Comprehension of the gravity of the crisis and the quest for a way out went hand in hand, theoretical breakthroughs advanced practical action, and practice, in turn, nurtured bold thinking and hastened the farewell to primitive dogmas amd ideological stereotypes that seemed to have been around for centuries.

Let us recall the most important milestones of this process. The CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum proposed a policy of significantly accelerating socioeconomic development by making extensive use of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution and bringing the forms of socialist management into line with modern conditions and demands. The emphasis was on activating the human factor, bringing organizational and economic and social reserves into play, and enhancing organization and discipline. The 27th CPSU Congress approved the course of acceleration as the party's strategic line.

It appeared that one needed only to correctly orient cadres and replace those who could not cope with

vigorous new people, and then things would be fine. But life was insistently demanding fundamental changes in the very structure of the established system, in the foundation of society. That is why, in the latter half of 1986, the idea of perestroyka throughout our social edifice was voiced increasingly loudly and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum substantially deepened the analysis of the state of affairs in the country and advocated radical changes. An economic program for perestroyka was swiftly devised and adopted by the Central Committee June (1987) plenum. The Central Committee October (1987) and February (1988) plenums encouraged radical changes in ideology and the spiritual sphere. The detailed plan for the political reform currently being implemented was elaborated by the 19th All-Union Party Conference. The integrated concept of perestroyka as a program of transition to a qualitatively new state of society and to a humane, democratic socialism was embodied in the draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th party congress.

Of course, there were bound to be mistakes—because of some people's lack of skill and others' resistance, and due to indecision and haste. Economic mistakes took their toll—such as the gap between the switch to enterprise independence and the formation of a full-blown market, and the loss of control over the state of affairs in the financial sphere. The hastily organized campaigns such as the "cavalry charge" against alcoholism and the fight against unearned income were ill-considered. There were also distortions in the organization of the cooperative movement. But there are mistakes and then there are mistakes. As V.I. Lenin said, assessing the errors of the first year of the New Economic Policy, there are errors of the "two times two equals five" variety and errors of the "two times two equals a tallow candle" type. In seeking answers to the very difficult questions posed by reality, the party leadership builds its policy organically on the basis of a socialist option, drawing on a considerably wider range of ideas and on worldwide experience, and does not lapse into eclecticism, into the "tallow candles" of a return to the past.

The past five years have encapsulated all the colors of life—joyous and dramatic. We have breathed the fresh spring air of glasnost and democracy—and the fumes of the conflagration of Chernobyl and Fergana. We have felt like free citizens in a free country, and we have experienced the consequences of a devastated consumer market, inflation, and the budget deficit, and felt the pain of interethnic strife and social instability. None of us, when summing up this period in our lives, is going to weigh the pros and cons and gains and losses on an apothecary's scales. As a rule, we are more concerned about what has not yet been done or what has been done wrong. Therefore, it is the difficulties and shortages that automatically come to the fore, the general anxiety and mental strain. Yet, despite all the problems and difficulties, one cannot help seeing that perestroyka has already borne fruit.

The past five years have transformed our country beyond recognition, and it will never be the same again. Soviet society today is different from what it was in 1985, and the contrast is much greater than that between the society of 1985 and that of 30-40 years ago. In a brief period we have covered a vast amount of ground in the sphere of democratization and glasnost, in the growth of ethnic self-awareness and transformation of the economy, in establishing the new political thinking and the primacy of general human values in the world arena, and in liberating the creative forces of people—the end and guarantors of revolutionary transformations. All the experience that has been accumulated over these years—positive and negative—makes it possible to say with conviction that the path of perestroyka we have chosen is the only correct road to guaranteeing people a decent life and to realizing the potential of our great country.

Following this path is not easy. Five years ago, at the Central Committee March (1985) plenum, M.S. Gorbachev stressed the correctness of Lenin's idea that a principled policy is the only correct policy. The country's leadership is sticking to this principled course in implementing the policy of perestroyka. We will boldly and consistently follow this path, resisting all the forces that would like to drive our ship off course, knock it to the left or to the right, send it back, or plunge it into the abyss of civil confrontation.

It is the job of the upcoming 28th party congress to more accurately delineate and adjust this course. And successful progress must be aided by creation of the institution of the presidency and election to the lofty post of USSR president of a worthy candidate who will be a powerful consolidating force in our society. Vigorous actions in this direction are the guarantee of swifter perestroyka and the resolution of acute socioeconomic and political problems.

So, it is spring again.... A time of hope, a time to sow and tend the shoots on the people's land. May the sower's hand never tire; may our hopes be realized!

Democratic Union Holds Unsanctioned Rally

LD1203205790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] The square near the Mayakovskiy monument looked different on the evening of 12 March, with portable metal barriers and militia details. It was here that the Democratic Union decided to mark the day of the 73d anniversary of the February Revolution. When the union's initiative group notified the Moscow Soviet permission was issued to hold the meeting, but in Luzhniki park. But the Democratic Union leadership again went for a direct confrontation by announcing the rally in an unsanctioned location. At 1900 [1600 GMT] several hundred of the union's activists, having unfurled posters and white, blue, and red flags, entered the square in front of the Moskva cinema and tried to hold a rally. After a warning from the militia about the unsanctioned nature of the venture and calls to disperse, the Special

Purpose Militia Detachment began to carry out its duties. More than 30 of the most active participants in the rally were detained.

Reactions to Pre-Election Demonstrations

90UN1083A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 9, 3-9 Mar 90 pp 2-3

[A. Petrov, V. Romanenko, A. Uglanov roundup: "Fear Has a Hundred Eyes"]

[Text] A wave of mass meetings organized by voter associations and clubs under slogans of a radicalization of perestroyka rolled over the country on 24 and 25 February, on the threshold of the elections to the soviets of people's deputies. Various rumors had been making their way around the country for several days prior to the start of the meetings.

Unfortunately, the appeals of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers only added fuel to the fire. People were forced to go to work in many ministries and departments and at enterprises on 24 and 25 February, and duty rosters were organized. Hospitals prepared to receive people with firearm wounds. Persons unknown put up leaflets intimidating Muscovites with a "new Khodynka."

Of course, all these precautionary measures may be viewed variously. However, to the credit of the organizers of the mass meeting—the leaders of the "Democratic Russia" Club—and its participants, it was conducted in an organized and tranquil fashion.

Our correspondents conducted a number of spot interviews with participants in the Moscow meeting.

USSR People's Deputy S. Stankevich:

I have just returned from Poland, where I saw L. Walesa. Contrary to some of our news reports, he did not declare that Polish democracy needed a "strong hand." Ninety percent of Poles trust their government, 56 percent believe in the success of their "perestroyka." I recalled Walesa's words: "At the start of our movement we were shouting 'Bread!' but whispering 'Freedom!' Now we are shouting 'Freedom!' and believe that it will bring us bread." The economic and political situation in Poland is stabilizing as a result.

We are here today to shout "Freedom!"

USSR People's Deputy T. Gdlyan:

The meeting is a powerful democratic force against the arbitrariness of the partocracy. I see no extremist forces among those who have come to the square. They are located, I believe, in the structure of the party and state machinery.

My expulsion from the Communist Party is a method from the set of weapons used to inflame the atmosphere on the eve of the meeting.

N. Vorontsov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection:

Rumors to the effect that the democratic bloc wished to use the meeting to seize power proved an utter absurdity.

Ultimately the boat may be rocked from both the left and the right. The false information about the dangers lying in wait for the electorate at the meeting emanated from forces with an interest in preserving their political positions. At the same time, however, I cannot agree with the slogans of the "Down With the CPSU!" type since this provides a trump card for the conservatives to play.

USSR People's Deputy G. Popov:

I believe that the campaign to intimidate the electorate prior to the elections has failed. People have come after having conquered their inherent fear. This is a victory for the democratic tendencies in society.

USSR People's Deputy A. Murashov:

Destabilization is coming from the apparatus, which is endeavoring to thwart the elections by any method.

This meeting does not aim at pressure on the state authorities.

USSR People's Deputy Yu. Afanasyev:

It is too early to tally the results, but, to judge by the atmosphere, the democratic bloc will win in Leningrad, Volgograd, Sverdlovsk.... In Moscow, as you can see, the conservative wing, which created hysteria around the meeting, poses a big threat. The confrontation of two forces has become apparent: On the one hand the authorities intimidating the electorate and putting it on edge, on the other, those same voters endeavoring to say that they are many and that they are fed up with running in place.

The USSR Supreme Soviet has found itself pulled into the game, in which the role of hostile, extremist force has been assigned the people.

How did similar meetings in other cities of the country pass off? We addressed this question to V. Maksimov, chief of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Main Administration for the Safeguarding of Public Order.

[Maksimov] Some 350 mass meetings were held on 25 February. According to our estimates, over 900,000 persons took part in them. From 250,000 to 300,000 in Moscow. Practically throughout the country all the mass activities passed off without incident.

[Correspondents] Did the variety of appeals for people to "see reason" which appeared in the press prior to 25 February contribute to the maintenance of public order?

[Maksimov] The inflaming of passions never contributes to a positive development of events. Excessive noise only harms matters.

[Correspondents] Were there in Moscow, for example, incidents between the organizers of the meeting and the police?

[Maksimov] No.

[Correspondents] As far as we know, the army and police officers were engaged to ensure order in Zubovskiy Square.

[Maksimov] Lately when we have been involved in such activities we have employed numbers of personnel which do not lead to the "exposure" of other parts of the city. After all, it was frequently the case that the number of police officers was virtually equal to that of those taking part in the mass meeting. This was imprudent. There were no such "superfluous" police officers, in my view, in the cordon at the mass meeting in Moscow. The organizers of the meeting themselves, who are responsible for all negative phenomena, thanked the police for the guaranteed order.

[Correspondents] People taking part in the meeting saw "suspicious" people on the rooftops. Were these snipers?

[Maksimov] There were no snipers on the roofs. I checked this out personally. These were either the curious or photographers.

[Correspondents] It is said that many police officers refused to carry weapons. So was our service armed?

[Maksimov] The unambiguous requirement when organizing the safeguarding of public order in such instances is that it be done without weapons. Armed officers directly at the scene of the activity are unnecessary.

But we always have reserves. Armed included. They have them elsewhere, it is true.

[Correspondents] Would you describe the organizers of the meetings which were held as "extremists?"

[Maksimov] The meetings were very motley in composition. I say this not to insult their participants. There were no extremists in the direct sense. [end of interview]

The number of meetings this year, according to USSR MVD data, is growing rapidly. Would it seem that this is, as is sometimes maintained, someone's "hand" juggling with us, endeavoring to destabilize the situation in the country? Hardly. We are tired of the five-year wait for really radical reforms both in political life and in the economy.

Dozens of proposals, not contrary to common sense, are not being realized and are disappearing like water into sand. Streams of words are coming one after the other. We need, finally, a start, the emancipation of the initiative of millions of people in both town and country. Only in this case will energy not be expended in the streets and on the squares, but at the place of work.

Party Veteran Challenges Multiparty Idea

PM0803134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

["Viewpoint" by V. Golubev, member of the CPSU since 1940, delegate to the 21st-26th Party Congresses, and member of the Board of the USSR Union of Journalists Board, under general rubric "Discussion Leaflet No. 12": "Where Are We Being Led?"]

[Text] Recently a newspaper published a feature in which seamen expressed their indignation at the decision to scrap the cruiser "Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsia" at one of the shipyards, perceiving this as the start to wrecking the gains of October. To corroborate this, they cited a number of examples from present-day life. I believe that the list could be continued. However, to what extent do these examples correspond to the truth?

Of late the mass media abound with materials about the rehabilitation of historical truth. Journalists, writers, scientists, and workers from the arts sphere are particularly concerned with this. This is understandable. People in the sphere of science and culture have always been and remain the most sensitive section of society with regard to all its anomalies. Several currents have appeared with diverging, but basically negative, assessments of the past which have gradually merged into a single river of criticism of the entire Soviet period. People have begun, with incredible ease, to rewrite the history of our party and state. However, it is useful to recall how V.I. Lenin understood the truth. He stressed that assessments by different groups expressing the interests of specific classes not only tend to diverge, but are sometimes even diametrically opposed. Take for instance the debates which have flared up about our revolutions, world wars, and current events in the Near East, Nicaragua, Panama, and even in the USSR. Nonetheless, the question arises: Whose interests are certain authors—party members and USSR people's deputies—expressing when they not only cast aspersions on the past and the present, but sometimes even falsify facts?

The party is urging us to actively join in the perestroyka and renewal of socialism, and meanwhile certain people are claiming at the Supreme Soviet session that socialism in our country does not exist. How can we restructure something that does not exist? The problem is that this absurdity is being widely bandied about in the press and at rallies. It seems to me that such "aberrations" and also the striving of certain deputies and journalists to change the title of the Supreme Soviet to parliament and that of its chairman to president should not go unanswered. This is taking place at a stage when the transfer of all power to the soviets is at issue. Identifying soviets with parliament is wrong since the soviets are an expression of people's power, while parliament is a form of expression of the power of capital. After all, in capitalist countries billionaires determine not only the economic policy but also the ideological thrust of society's development. The parliaments in capitalist countries include virtually no

workers or peasants and if there are some, they are shareholders or representatives of individual bourgeois parties.

It has become fashionable now to take our cue from the civilized capitalist world, forgetting that socialist civilization in its Marxist-Leninist interpretation is different from bourgeois civilization, and copying it is wrong for communists who have chosen a completely different theory and practice of building a society.

Yes, perestroyka is not an easy matter, especially now in the period of an impending threat when the question of mankind's survival has been raised. Class confrontation now smacks of death. Universal human interests must be placed in the forefront. It cannot be ignored that the creation of the socialist system has exerted a great influence on the capitalist world. The latter has considerably restructured itself in recent decades. The breakthrough in scientific and technical progress has smoothed over its former ugly corners. On the other hand, our former party and state leadership was unable to grasp the complex processes taking place in the world and did not avail itself of the advantages of socialism which this system possesses. This is why it is so important at the present crucial stage to avoid further miscalculations and mistakes, yet, it seems to me, they are becoming increasingly likely in connection with the adoption of a number of laws and the drafting of the new USSR Constitution. Especially dangerous is the haste during the switch from one form of ownership to another.

Certain economists, including party members, believe without good reason that only a swift transition to market and leasing relations will pull our economy out of the crisis, forgetting that during the war years we managed to reorientate ourselves within a very short time and subsequently we swiftly restored the country's national economy. It is not the fault of state and public ownership that, deviating from Leninist principles in the building of socialism, the central leadership foisted the administrative-command system on the party and the people, depriving enterprises and sovkhozes and kolkhozes of all independence. However, even despite these conditions there are quite a few factories, plants, sovkhozes, and kolkhozes which are performing well, which proves that this form of production organization has untapped potential.

As for the creation of joint enterprises together with foreign firms in conditions where more than 40 percent of the profit will pass into the hands of private capitalist enterprises, this step is causing great misgivings. It directly paves the way toward the exploitation of Soviet citizens by foreign capital.

Party veterans are alarmed at the situation which is taking shape in the CPSU. There are now many advocates of a multiparty system, however they do not state what party they are lacking. Do they not remember that we did have a multiparty system in our country in the past? We experienced it and know how much strength it cost the people. The struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, the left-wing Socialist Revolutionaries, and anarchists also cost the lives of quite a few of these parties' members and subsequently it also affected the unity of the Bolshevik Party when it became the ruling party.

It is also known what upheavals have taken place and are taking place in countries with a multiparty system. The USSR has overcome this ailment by chosing a thorny and long path; however, the one-party system does not seem to suit certain people. They want an interparty struggle. For what sort of ideals, one may ask. Is it possible to forget perhaps that the multiparty system is the fertile ground in which capital, or rather its owners, thrive. In any developed capitalist country the presence of various parties, alliances, clubs, and religious and nationalist formations furnishes an opportunity to divide the working people. What our multinational people need is a consolidation rather than division of all the forces on the path of perestroyka.

'Insinuations' About Lenin Trouble His Niece

PM1203113590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Yu. Yuryev report: "Conversation in the Editorial Office"]

[Text] V.I. Lenin's niece Olga Dmitriyevna Ulyanova, daughter of his brother Dmitriy, visited the PRAVDA editorial office. In the course of a conversation with PRAVDA Chief Editor I. Frolov, [secretary of the CPSU Central Committee], she asked about the editorial office's planned coverage of the 120th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth and voiced her concern in connection with the increasing volume of sundry insinuations surrounding his name and his ideological and theoretical legacy.

Olga Dmitriyevna offered PRAVDA some of the material she has written on V.I. Lenin's life and activity.

Unwanted Brezhnev, Suslov 'Works' Up for Sale

PM1203160390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 90 p 1

[Unnamed TASS correspondent report: "Rebirth?"]

[Text] "The sociopolitical literature of the years of stagnation has not been deleted from current stocks," Ye. Yastrzhembskaya, deputy director of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Public History Library, said, "but it has literally choked our exchange and reserve stocks and caused a logjam. There would seem to be just one way out—books not in demand should be pulped. But the idea of destroying any book is sacrilege for a librarian who loves his work!

"Hence the sale of 3,000 copies of 'works' by L.I. Brezhnev, M.A. Suslov, M.S. Solomentsev, T. Zhivkov, and others.

"We have avoided barbaric treatment of the books. This conforms with the principles of civilized society. Furthermore, we hope the sale will generate funds to enable us to supplement our stocks."

Semipalatinsk Radiation Effects Cited

PM1203135190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent V. Mirolevich: "Around Testing Range"]

[Text] Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—A joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security and Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Utilization of Natural Resources has been held, at which it was proposed to move the nuclear testing range from Semipalatinsk Oblast to Novaya Zemlya.

The question has not been finally decided. The parliamentarians have decided first to assess and weigh up all possible consequences of this action. As S. Tseplyayev, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security, told the editorial office, "Painstaking expert assessments are required for taking a final decision. Then the question of the Semipalatinsk testing range will again go on the agenda of the Supreme Soviet Committees..." After all, as is well known, in March the country's government should, on instructions from the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, set forth its position to parliament and submit its proposals on the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing range. The decision—whether nuclear explosions will be carried out here or not—is awaited with hope and alarm by the inhabitants of Semipalatinsk and adjacent oblasts.

But in the meantime there are meetings and demonstrations... The people's diplomacy of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk antinuclear movement is operating actively. Those who are convinced that it is necessary to continue to test weapons in the Kazakh steppe are not sitting idly by either. The screen of secrecy over the testing range's activity has always given certain advantages to the representatives of the military-industrial complex. References to examples and research with which civilians are not allowed to familiarize themselves have turned the discussions into a futile dispute between emotional dilettantes and specialists.

The "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" movement and public demands to make public the testing range's secrets have half-opened some pages of the military's 40 years of activity. Indeed, today it is possible to stand with a radiation monitor on the concreted aperture of the nuclear borehole. You can argue about whether the eruption of mental illnesses is dependent on the regular force four or five earthquakes caused by the underground explosions. But how to forget, how to fail to consider, that from 1949 through 1963 this land experienced hundreds of Hiroshimas and Nagasakis?! Nuclear and hydrogen devices were detonated in the air and on the ground 30 km from villages. You can imagine what the local inhabitants experienced here if sometimes the glass windows broke in Ust-Kamenogorsk (a little over 300 km from the site of the incidents).

The specially created interdepartmental commission acknowledged that mortality among babies, children, and mothers and the population in general, mental retardation, and congenital abnormalities are high in the regions adjacent to the testing range and in Semipalatinsk City. The mental disorder rate is increasing. Suicides have become more common.... I stress that this was the first attempt in 40 years to conduct a comprehensive medical study of the local population.

It has been established that the average life span in the oblast has dropped by three years in the past 20 years. A drastic weakening of the immune system was discovered in half the Semipalatinsk inhabitants studied... Some doctors called this phenomenon "Semipalatinsk AIDS." And one more fact: Outbreaks of cancers here coincide in full with similar figures for Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In October last year an event took place to which no special significance was accorded in Semipalatinsk: A secret known to all was revealed. By a decree of the USSR Health Ministry the antibrucellosis clinic was renamed the USSR Health Ministry radiological clinic. There was no need to change the clinic's specialty—this medical institution has never studied the problem of brucellosis. Disguised to fit the specific features of the sheep rearing region, the military doctors from the USSR Health Ministry third administration have since the sixties been studying the effects of radiation on the local population here.

From the scientific viewpoint the clinic workers have accumulated priceless material. But the moral aspect of secret medicine does not fit into the framework of common sense. The institution has been operating for nearly 30 years but figures from its research are kept secret to this day from the local health service. Alarming changes in the health of the Semipalatinsk people were explained by anything you like except the effect of the tests. And it was while geared to this lie that the local doctors treated their patients....

The clinic's transition to legal status has somewhat weakened the regime of secrecy. This has enabled the oblast soviet of people's deputies to inquire officially how the institution structures its work. The clinic's chief doctor, B. Gusev, gave a written reply to the query:

"In the period from 1961 through to the present, the clinic's medical department has carried out a repeated and dynamic study of the population from some of the population centers of three rayons of Semipalatinsk Oblast (Abayskiy, Beskaragayskiy, and Zhanasemeyskiy

rayons). Because of the medical department's material and technical potential and staffing levels, only 25-30 percent of the population subjected to ionizing radiation in the period 1949 through 1963 were studied and taken into account.... Approximately 10,000 more people were studied as control groups.... Some of those studied in the control groups were people from population centers which had not been subjected to pollution by fission products."

No radiation monitors can measure the tragedy of Semipalatinsk. It ranks with the nationwide grief of Chernobyl and the Aral Sea. It is a political and ecological disaster which can no longer be stopped by banning explosions. Even if the testing range had been closed 27 years ago with the ending of tests in three environments, the secret medical subdepartment would have had enough "material" for study right up to the end of the second millenium.

But meanwhile tension is mounting among the region's inhabitants. The deputies of the new local soviets are expressing the feelings of their voters in what is no longer a pleading form. They are demanding an immediate ban on the tests.

1.5 Milllion AIDS Cases Predicted by 2000

LD1202095390 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Experts of the Ministry of Public Health predict that by the year 2000, the Soviet Union may have more than 30,000 AIDS patients and up to 1.5 million persons infected with AIDS.

The president of the Academy of Medical Sciences, Valentin Pokrovskiy, has spoken out in this connection for emergency measures against the spread of this plague of the 20th censtury. A bill is being drafted on AIDS prophylactics. The bill will have new points such as guarantees of rights of the infected people for medical and social assistance, as well as for personal immunity. The USSR was among the first nations to advance an initiative about a global program to combat AIDS.

International Power Association Founded in Moscow

LD1302231290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2100 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Summary] An International Fuel and Power Association [Mezhdunarodnaya Toplivno-Energeticheskaya Assotsiatsiya] [video shows both names on screen in Russian and English] has been founded in Moscow. It should help Soviet wastefulness in the use of power resources and environmental damage. It is a nongovernment organization and aims to create and introduce new, ecologically clean technologies, without forgetting tried and tested methods such as windmills. L.A. Puchkov, the association's vice president, says that the organization will study the whole spectrum of potential energy sources—unlike any other existing body. [Video shows a meeting in progress; on the table are a Soviet, U.S. and an unidentified red-and-yellow flag; delegates; the Association's logo; interview with puchkov]

Former Petroleum Refining Minister Fedorov Dies

PM0602085590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Obituary of Viktor Stepanovich Fedorov]

[Excerpts] Viktor Stepanovich Fedorov, the former USSR minister of the petroleum refining and petrochemical industry and a personal pensioner of union status, died 1 February 1990 after a prolonged illness.

V.S. Fedorov was born in the city of Armavir, Krasnodar Kray in 1912. [passage omitted]
[Signed] V.I. Vorotnikov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, O.D. Baklanov, V.K. Gusev, N.V. Lemayev, V.A. Bykov, L.I. Filimonov, G.F. Sukhoruchenkova, A.A. Petrov, V.V. Listov, A.I. Lukashov, N.M. Olshanskiy, A.A. Yezhevskiy.

KGB Staffers Deplore Delays in Legislation

PM0803135190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Mar 90 p 3

[V. Ostrovskiy report: "What Worries the Chekists?"]

[Text] An appeal by staffers of the KGB central apparatus adopted at their general meeting has been circulated among USSR people's deputies. It is addressed to people's deputies.

Drawing attention to difficulties in the process of perestroyka under way in the country, the authors of the document stress that forces whose activity is aimed at eliminating Soviet power and wrecking the federative Soviet state are seeking to exploit those difficulties.

The chekists, who defend the Soviet people's interests and the integrity and security of the state in the execution of their duty and in response to the summons of the heart, are worried that the merging of criminal organizations and groups with corrupt officials at various levels of managerial structures is continuing.

The appeal stresses that antisocial elements are deliberately exacerbating interethnic relations to destabilize the situation. In a number of regions of the country they have to all intents and purposes paralyzed Soviet power. They are to blame for the shedding of innocent blood.

The adoption of a number of laws important for the normal functioning of society is being delayed: laws on the USSR State Security Committee, on crimes against the state, on crimes against peace and the security of mankind, on the rights and duties of the militia, and a number of others. The absence of these laws denies a legal basis to the fight against the most dangerous forms of organized crime, corruption, and crime in the sphere of foreign economic activity and prevents the security of the state and citizens being effectively ensured.

Soviet chekists do not cut themselves off from society, the appeal says, they are aware of their responsibility for the country's future and are doing their level best to further the success of perestroyka and render it irreversible.

Komsomol Reform Body Meets in Novosibirsk

LD0502221190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Feb 90

[Text] The latest meeting of supporters of radical democratic transformations in the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] has taken place near Novosibirsk within the framework of the Surgut initiative movement. A declaration was adopted on the creation of an interregional association of delegates for the 21st VLKSM [Komsomol] Congress and the Komsomol congresses of the union republics. The package of documents includes the platform of the Surgut alternative for the 21st Komsomol Congress, the draft statues of a new democratic youth organization—the creation of which will be called for at the congress by the supporters of radical transformations—and draft regulations for the congress. The Surgut alternative movement recognizes the slogan "All power to the Soviets" as the main one in perestroyka, and supports the aspiration of the interregional group of USSR people's deputies for radical democratic changes. Touching on the problems of the youth press, the participants in the meeting believe, in particular, that it is essential to transform MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, the magazine of the VLKSM Central committee, into a VLKSM sociopolitical and scientific-theoretical magazine of democratic orientation, and to elect a new chief editor for the magazine at the congress.

Constitution Commission Chief of Democratic Party

LD1102233590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 11 February in its "Seven Days" newscast broadcasts a two-minute interview in the studio with Sergey Aleksayev, the chairman of the Committee for Supervision of the Constitution, presented by Aleksandr Krutov. Alekseyev is asked to comment on the preceding interview with the Democratic Party chairman.

Alekseyev says that it is necessary to take a calm and tolerant attitude to such things as this Democratic Party. A dialogue must be conducted. The pitfall of the multiparty system, he considers, is that associations can spring up "like mushrooms", and that they may be linked only to words, declarations, or the claims of individuals. "Real political pluralism must also arise from the economic system", he thinks. "And it would clearly be very useful for us to prevent a turn of events whereby these parties, these sociopolitical organizations are engaged in real work."

CPSU 'Democratic Platform' Meets in Moscow

LD1002200690 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] The coordination council of the Soviet Communist Party's democratic platform has been meeting in Moscow. The newly formed faction seeks to turn the Communist Party into a parliamentary party to work under a multiparty system. The meeting involved a number of people's deputies of the USSR inlcuding Gavriil Popov, Yuriy Afanasyev, and Telman Gdlyan. It focused on the recent plenary session of the Communist Party's Central Committee. Most speakers criticized the decisions the session took as not radical enough. They suggested submitting an alternative platform for discussion by the whole Communist Party. Speakers pointed out they were not planning to immediately form a new party; instead they were going to win a larger support within the party on the eve of its 28th congress.

Economic

Association Converts to Civilian Production

LD1103103290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 11 Mar 90

[Summary] As part of the conversion program, the 50-Letiye Association in Tbilisi is now producing compact TV antennas, TV remote control units and household goods. An enterprise has been set up in conjunction with a U.S. firm to manufacture complex domestic appliances and medical equipment. Talks are underway with Italian businessmen on joint production of computerized wheelchairs for invalids.

Business Leader on Industrial Supply Shortages

904A0228A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 25 Jan 90 p 1

[Report on an interview with Chairman of the Lithuanian Association of Industrialists Rimvidas Yasinavichyus by V. Skripov; date and place not given: "Six Principles of Enterprise"]

[Text] We do not have to introduce Rimvidas Yasinavichyus to our readers: This leader of Lithuanian businessmen has outlined his views on the pages of our newspaper many times. The peculiarity of our conversation today is in our decision to "debrief" the chairman of the Association of Lithuanian Industrialists in his more modest capacity as a production manager:

[Skripov] What is your mood early this year, the esteemed general director of "Vilma?"

[Yasinavichyus] The mood is good. We have something to be proud of. Judge for yourself: For two years in a row, productivity at the enterprise has increased at a rate of 20 percent. This means that at our rate we covered in one year the distance which has been set for the republic for the entire five-year plan. The wages are going up by 15

percent. You would agree that economic proportions are excellent: At the same time, the ratio of outstripping has been maintained, and the pace has made it possible to stay ahead of inflation. Therefore, there is every reason to feel gratified both morally and financially.

[Skripov] What can you say about this feeling regarding the plan for this year?

[Yasinavichyus] The plan holds no promise of quiet existence. It is up 20 percent yet again. This is why I should cry "Help me!" in keeping with the laws of stagnation. However, I will not do this because we understand that opportunities for further development and affluence are found only through growth. I think that we will find reserves.

However, supply prospects concern us more than ever before. The emerging severance of ties with partners in other regions of our country, especially the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] is the reason. Political ambitions are beginning to be manifested ("So, you are going to secede—get this..."). This is sad.

[Skripov] Alas, I have already happened to hear similar reports from production managers on many occasions. How do you, managers, evaluate the eventual influence of the political factor on the republic economy in this case? Will this not take us into a dead end?

[Yasinavichyus] Certainly, there will be costs involved, but this is not a dead end. After all, most enterprises of our republic are processing units. Throughout the world, raw materials cost less than finished products. This is why those who live by the principle "if I can't have it nobody can have it" ultimately lose. Indeed, if ambitions get the upper hand we will experience difficulties. However, we will ultimately find a market on the other side if not on this side, and will still get the necessary minimum of benefits in return for our work. After all, we have skills, and this is what matters. So, they say that oil will become more expensive. However, if oil becomes more expensive gasoline prices will automatically go up. However, we will still retain the difference between these prices as payment for our work on refining it.

However, in order not to simplify the situation I will enumerate six principles on the basis of which the administrative-command system of management may be converted into a system of economic enterprise.

[Skripov] It is interesting. What is the first principle?

[Yasinavichyus] Every enterprise should have an independent status. They write and talk about it a lot but, unfortunately, the central apparatus still regards this as heresy. At any rate, Chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] Yu. Maslyukov came out unequivocally against the ownership of enterprise collectives at a meeting with Lithuanian production managers. In the draft Law on Ownership, some incomprehensible hybrids such as "union-republic property" have appeared.

I believe that we will not overcome the alienation of man from the results and instruments of labor until property is localized down to the level of immediate producers. In the course of it, I look at leasing as a test of sorts on the basis of which we should decide to whose possession the economic units are to be transferred. There should be no leveling in this matter; a collective should prove that it is capable of using property efficiently and enhancing it before it is given the right to acquire it. Only after that the state and society may transfer wealth to the possession of a specific master.

As far as subsequent social control over the operation of this property is concerned, it should be exercised through taxation, as is the case throughout the world: If the main share of income is invested in developing production all kinds of preferences and support are given; if they decide to eat it away, state protection through a draconian tax applies. The operation of independent enterprises should fall within the scope of republic regulation.

The second principle: All economic sectors and forms enjoy equal rights. I absolutely fail to understand, for example, the considerations for which the tax rate for cooperatives has been set at 10-15 percent and for the state enterprises at 50 percent. I believe that a uniform law on enterprises and entrepreneurship should be issued in the republic which should set forth the main principles of enterprise operations regardless of the form of property. Only in this case will a natural environment for determining the most stable and promising economic forms emerge.

The continuity of contracts between economic units is the third principle.

[Skripov] Like continuity which is maintained in interstate practice: The governments change but the treaties remain...

[Yasinavichyus] Absolutely correct. This provision should even be set forth at the level of union and republic contracts. The fourth principle which, to my mind, is very important is closely associated with the previous one: The development of economic contacts itself should be determined and steered on the basis of just one criterion, that of economic efficiency. This involves primarily the central planning and distribution organs. Let us say that currency is being allocated: who is to be given it? I believe that enterprises should be given preference which, having bought raw materials or equipment with it, are capable of turning out goods which are in short supply and the purchase of which abroad would require considerably more currency.

[Skripov] One Hungarian economist stated the following idea concerning this: Supporting weak enterprises all the

time has been one of the main mistakes in the economic policy of the state in our countries. It is the strong ones that need to be supported.

[Yasinavichyus] Exactly. I will use one more example to explain my idea. They may tell us: We are not going to give you cotton, we need it ourselves. This is an incorrect way to approach this issue. Before an answer is given, we should look at who in the Soviet Union can make a maximum of useful products from one ton of cotton. They should be given preferences subsequently. The same applies to timber and other types of raw materials. After all, we will only be able to develop economic and political ties from which both parties benefit on this basis.

Incidentally, decisions made on the basis of a different logic are only possible within the framework of a bureaucratic system under which the administrative apparatus bears no economic responsibility for its whims. Political ambitions may prevail over economic feasibility only under this system.

[Skripov] In your speech at the meeting with Yu. Maslyukov, you formulated a demand for resources which many people did not understand...

[Yasinavichyus] This is exactly the fifth principle which, perhaps, I did not explain well then due to the lack of time. The point was that in the course of distributing resources in short supply subject to allotment the Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] organs should provide supplies to enterprises not only in the amount corresponding to state orders, as has been envisaged, but in the amount of 100 percent of their production. After all, saying that we will give you 90 percent, and you will have to look for the remaining 10 percent yourselves is like sending one to a shop to buy a car without an allocation voucher. On the other hand, what are the motives of the state for failing to provide supplies for products not covered by the state order? At any rate, whether they are sold abroad for hard currency or inside the country, they meet a social need.

The next issue: Who is to be given preference? After all, given the shortage, one recipient may only be given something at the expense of another. However, in principle this problem should be solved in keeping with the previous rule. Once it has been determined that this product is more important, supplies for its production should be provided in full.

Finally, the last, sixth principle: The state should give all kinds of incentives to enterprises which eliminate shortages. For example, if soap or detergents have disappeared we should look at the entire chain of links operating in this type of production and create a maximum of incentives for making production advantageous rather than upbraid the producers. In this case, the shortages will go away by themselves.

Overall, not too many issues of principle have to be resolved systemically in order to make our economy modern and efficient. However, they need to be resolved firmly and completely.

Bank Official Describes Gold Trading Operations

PM0903121390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[Interview in Moscow with E. Gostev, chairman of the Bank for Foreign Economic Activity Board, by N. Larionova; date unspecified, under the rubric "Topical Interview": "Gold"; first six paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Moscow—Everything now looks quite different, but back then...

...The door looked in no way different from the others. Very high and heavy, it was a door in an old building long overdue for repair. The worn staircase to the second floor bore the marks of hundreds of heels, and the paint on the bannisters was peeling. It was clear that a once majestic building that was the pride of Moscow had become run down without anyone noticing, had lost its former sheen, and had finally become a second-rate apartment block.

It was on that door in Pushkinskaya Street that I knocked. It was opened by a polite young man in a dark three-piece suit. And I immediately entered the 21st century. The contrast between the building's outward appearance and its inner contents was unusual. Even the most gifted fantasist would not have been prepared to find an ultramodern electronics center behind the dusty windows and, of course, no outsider would have dreamed that all our country's gold trading is done behind this door. Admittedly, I did not see any of the gold here.

As is well known, our country has very rich gold reserves. And, the West believes, we are the world's second largest producer after South Africa. From time immemorial precious metals have been a popular commodity in Russian trade. They have not lost their importance nowadays either. The gold trade is now handled by the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity [Vneshekonombank] Precious Metals Department, whose staffers, using the modern computerized Reuters dealing system and telephones; trade gold, silver, and platinum with the world's largest banks and firms 18 hours a day.

The point is that the precious metals market operates virtually around the clock. When it is still early morning in Moscow, banks in Japan, Australia, and Hong Kong are at the height of their working day. And when the sun is setting the New York market is opening.

Spending a full working day among clever machines and their no less clever "operators," I realized that the laws of the gold market can only be divined by looking at it from the inside—that is, through the eyes of a man who

plunges every day into the maelstrom of the international foreign exchange and precious metals markets. That is why I put my numerous questions to E. Gostev, deputy chairman of the Vneshekonombank Board:

[Larionova] In the first few years following the revolution we made no secret of the fact that we were selling gold. Until the mid-thirties we published figures on production even at individual mines. But what about now? Why has everything become secret? How much gold do we produce? What are our gold reserves? How much do we sell and how much foreign exchange do we earn from it?

[Gostev] I do not think that we are scared to admit that we export precious metals. We sell gold, silver, and platinum and are a constant presence in the marketplace. The question is simply: How much do we sell and when? That is a business secret. It would be ridiculous if we announced beforehand that we were planning to sell 20-30 tonnes of gold tomorrow. In that case market traders would sell gold on the eve of the Soviet sales, thereby pushing the price down by a couple, if not 10, dollars. And a few dollars an ounce when you're talking about a tonne of metal amounts to tens of thousands of dollars of profit or loss.

As far as publishing production data is concerned, in my view this could help to strengthen our credit-worthiness. After all, a country's gold reserves are proof of a debtor's solvency and a kind of investment guarantee to foreign creditors. And it is a shame that figures on Soviet gold reserves are still published only by foreign journalists and are conjecture. It seems to me that at a time when our foreign debt is no longer a secret we should not miss out on an opportunity to reaffirm our credit-worthiness ourselves.

[Larionova] What is the advantage of being a constant presence in the marketplace?

[Gostev] That is normal for any player. We have been following this policy for just a few years. Previously, in the fifties and sixties, we were only visible as sellers of gold. And when we asked agents to quote their prices, they knew that we wanted to sell. Now they don't know for sure what we want to do. So they can only quote the real market prices. If they quote a low price, we buy instead of sell. And, moreover, it allows us to guard against significant drops in the market price when selling and to make a profit by exploiting price movements.

The Vneshekonombank's status too has changed over the past few years. We are not only a state bank with ministerial rights, but also a commercial bank which can independently operate in the gold market and conclude deals at its own risk. On the whole, we make a profit. We are helped in determining development trends by a department which analyzes exchange rate and gold market fluctuations. The specialists compile daily, weekly, monthly, and annual graphs. Using computers such figures can be compared with the fluctuation graphs for last year and for the past few years.

[Larionova] Wouldn't it be easier to trade in one of the financial centers? New York or London, for instance?

[Gostev] I think there's no need for that. Now that electronics and communications systems allow us to monitor the state of the market anywhere in the world at the press of a button and it is possible to conclude a deal in a second, there is no need for a physical presence in the marketplace. But there was a time when we dealt with agents via central telegraph systems. The telegraph operator tried to communicate by telex and hours were spent on communications. It was even harder to get through by phone. And that was quite recently, in the seventies. But now it just takes a few seconds to do a deal.

[Larionova] Gold, like oil, is a very sensitive item in our exports. What would happen to the world market if, one fine day, the Soviet Union didn't sell a single ounce?

[Gostev] It's very hard to say what would happen to the market. There are many large producers nowadays. These include the United States, Australia, Canada, and other countries. Our absence from the marketplace could be covered by other producers or holders of gold. After all, huge quantities of gold are held by investors and banks. Gold accounts for up to 25 percent of portfolios of large corporations: Precious metals are the guarantee of their financial might and insurance against violent currency swings. But if the gold price goes up, investors will be interested in taking profits. And that situation is just as attractive to gold companies, because it allows them to increase production and sales. There would be no vacuum in the market.

[Larionova] How much does gold cost?

[Gostev] Gold currently costs approximately $400 an ounce (31.1 grams). That is, each tonne of gold sold earns our state $12-13 million dollars. At the same time, metal prices change hundreds of times in the course of a day. Dealers can earn large profits by correctly guessing the next price movement. Moreover, the gold price depends on the quality of the gold. Soviet gold, which is 99.99 percent pure, is on average 20-30 percent more expensive than the commonly accepted 99.5 percent international standard.

[Larionova] What is your attitude to the claims that we are selling stocks that are exhaustible and that we will ultimately be left without any gold at all?

[Gostev] Look, gold is a commodity you can always get back if you have the money. It's not a work of art. We are currently exporting precious metals because we're short of foreign exchange. But after a certain time, when we eradicate that shortage, we will be able to enter the market and do the reverse—buying back all this gold. It may not be Soviet-produced. That is what South Korea and Taiwan—which were still poor countries 10 years ago—did. And then there was an economic miracle, they improved their balance of payments, and are now buying gold.

Taiwan and South Korea are increasing their gold reserves as insurance against the future. This refutes the conclusion that gold has ceased to play a reserve role or has lost its so-called monetary importance. The central banks of a number of countries invest their capital in gold. More than one-third of all the gold produced in the world is held in state reserves. More than 70 percent of U.S. currency reserves are held in gold (more than 8,000 tonnes). France holds around 65 percent of its currency in gold (2,500 tonnes), while Switzerland, Italy, and the Netherlands hold more than 50 percent.

[Larionova] What is your attitude to the idea of pledging [zalozhit] our gold reserves to raise capital and, a few years later when the economy is firmly on its feet, redeeming it? After all, there have been cases of this.

[Gostev] Yes, there have been such cases in history. But these involved small amounts of gold—50-150 tonnes. There would simply be no advantage in pledging precious metals on the scale you're talking about. And here's why. The size of the sum received is always less than real value—the creditors have to be sure that if the gold is not bought back they can sell it without making a loss. That is why we have to clearly realize that nobody will pay a full price in such circumstances. And if at the end of the term we didn't buy the gold back, it would simply have been a loss-making enterprise.

Moreover, major quantities of gold, if pledged, would cause chaos in the market and could ultimately have an unambiguous impact on the state of the precious metals market. And suppose we couldn't redeem the pledge, and world prices soared?

One other point: Everyone knows that goods are only pledged when there is nothing else you can do. And if we did this, our partners' attitudes to us would immediately change. We would only be given credit on crippling terms. And is it worth arranging a pledge simply to saturate the domestic market with consumer goods? Perhaps it would be better to organize production?

At the same time, the bank's reputation would be shaken. Our foreign partners believe us when we say that we can sell gold whenever necessary and in the necessary quantities without disrupting the market mechanism. It seems to me that before taking such a dangerous step we should properly weigh all the "pros" and "cons," since the consequences of such an operation are now hard to even imagine.

[Larionova] One last, theoretical question: Is gold a commodity or a currency?

[Gostev] Neither our academics nor our economists can answer that one. Some would say that it's a commodity, others that it's a currency. I would say that gold is a currency commodity. [Gostev ends]

...A great deal changed while this item was being prepared for the press. The gold price rose sharply and then fell equally sharply. Success alternates with losses in the business operations of the precious metals department. But the day has come when the life of the Vneshekonombank has fundamentally changed: All its departments have finally moved into a new building on Novokirovskiy Prospekt equipped with the lastest in science and technology.

This modern building with its bright windows cordially greets visitors, and its high-speed elevators seem to be waiting just for you. The precious metals department now has a large room with glass partitions. Soft carpeting muffles footsteps. Each dealing position is surrounded by several phones and displays. And work here is faster and more enjoyable.

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Remarks on Possible Envoy to Moscow

LD1303151790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0844 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Remarks by Lithuanian Supreme Council session Chairman Aleksandras Abisalas and Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council during the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] [Abisalas] At 1000 [0700 GMT] this morning Egidijus Bickauskas, the USSR people's deputy, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and deputy of Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, made a phone call from Moscow.

[Begin recording of Bickauskas' phone call] A report on the whole situation in Lithuania was made publicly from the rostrum in Moscow by Antanaitis; he described the content of the adopted documents and announced that an envoy of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania had arrived who had brought a letter and documents to Gorbachev. Egidijus Bickauskas [Bickauskas speaks in third person as heard], as an officially authorized representative of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, presented the set of adopted documents to Mr. Gorbachev. E. Bickauskas was not given the floor. However, Gorbachev commented that a number of photocopies would be made of these documents and that the USSR People's Deputies would be given a copy of these documents. [end recording]

[Landsbergis] There is a little inaccuracy in the recorded telephone call. It should be said that the person was authorized by chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. Early this morning I authorized Egidijus Bickauskas to carry out this task, and he left for Moscow.

One more piece of additional information was given to me, which is semi-private in nature. However, it carries a political content. Namely, although Gorbachev did not make any comment and, as far as we have heard, Bickauskas did not make an official statement, at that moment Gorbachev allegedly asked E. Bickauskas if he would agree to take the post of the plenipotentiary ambassador of the Republic of Lithuania in Moscow.

Vilnius Radio Carries 12 Mar Supreme Council

Second Day Opens

LD1203124790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0908 GMT on 12 March begins live coverage of the second day of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session. It is noted that the "Vytis" Lithuanian state coat of arms already adorns the hall as the session opens.

At 0912 GMT, Vytautas Landsbergis welcomes all the deputies present and asks them to remember those people who have been fighting and making sacrifices for their homeland. He thanks all those who have made contributions to the restoration of Lithuania's independence. He thanks the group of people's deputies from Lithuania in Moscow, stressing that these deputies are the first to be elected in multiparty democratic elections. A special decision wil be taken on their work in Moscow later on.

He says that there is great joy in Lithuania following yesterday's decisive step by the council. There is so far a very laconic response from Moscow; when he obtains more information, he will report to the Supreme Council. According to him, there is a positive response from Washington, urging Moscow to start negotiations with Lithuania. Australia also urges the Soviet Union to recognize the will of the Lithuanian people.

At 0936 GMT, Landsbergis says that the session should adopt further documents. He invites Deputy Gediminas Vainoris to make a report on changing the status of enterprises under union-republican administration. During the debate an opinion is expressed that all these enterprises and offices should be under republican administration, except gas and oil supply enterprises and those belonging to the Soviet Armed Forces. One deputy says that the nuclear power station should be included in this category. An opinion is expressed that consultations should take place with each of these enterprises before taking any decision, because this could cause interruptions in the supply of goods and raw materials.

At 0955 GMT, Deputy Kazimiera Prunskiene urges the session not to be hasty in adopting any document of such importance. Lengthy negotiations must take place about many enterprises.

At 1001 GMT, debates on this topic continue. Landsbergis proposes that a special editorial commission should be set up to cope with this document.

At 1007 GMT, Deputy Kazimiera Prunskiene says that the adoption of such a document would not create any danger of harming economic relations among various enterprises.

At 1010 GMT, proposals are made concerning the composition of an editorial commission to draw up this document. It is stated that this problem cannot be decided today, and it proposed that the session should adopt a brief law on changing the status of these enterprises and offices.

At 1020 GMT, Deputy Vilkas says that at present such a law on the change of the status of these enterprises is not necessary. First a new government should be formed, and it can cope with this problem.

At 1022 GMT, Landsbergis proposes that an editorial commission should examine such a document. Before

putting anything to the vote, he asks the vote counting commission to report how many deputies were present. There is a quorum.

At 1031 GMT, the debate on this topic continues. A vote is taken on drawing up a draft law on the change of the status of the enterprises and offices under union-republican administration.

At 1037 GMT, Landsbergis states that an official appeal to the head of the Soviet state should be immediately prepared. He asks Algirdas Brazauskas to take part in the preparation of such document.

At 1039 GMT, the session adjourns.

At 1130 GMT, the presenter reports that the commission for drawing up various documents is still working, and the session will resume at 1500 GMT.

Procedural Matters Discussed

LD1203145490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1300 GMT on 12 March resumes its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session. Greetings to the session are read out on behalf of former political prisoners and exiles by former political prisoner Bialiauskiene.

At 1305 GMT, discussions start on who should help in the chairmanship at the session. It is established that 125 deputies are taking part in the work of the session. A decision is taken that one deputy should help the chairman of the council to conduct procedures.

At 1315 GMT, with Deputy Abisalas in the chair, a statement is made that television and radio should relay important meetings of the Supreme Council, but television should carry only summarized reports from the session when there are no important affairs to debate, while the radio should continue live broadcasts. Today television broadcasts should be discontinued after the session has made important decisions.

At 1325 GMT, Landsbergis reads out an appeal to Mikhail Gorbachev. Deputy Antanavicius then proposes that the Soviet Union should be asked to recognize independent Lithuania and then start negotiations. Debates start on whether to address Gorbachev as his excellency or as greatly esteemed. There are some criticisms of the wording of the appeal. One deputy states that Gorbachev should be ask to protect the safety of Lithuanians serving in the Soviet Armed Forces. A proposal is submitted that for this purpose another letter should be sent to Gorbachev. Another proposal states that a wish should be expressed that Lithuania desires to maintain goodneighbourly relations with the Soviet Union. The appeal is to be reedited.

At 1341 GMT, Landsbergis reads out a message to Soviet Premier Ryzhkov.

At 1354 GMT, Landsbergis reads the edited version of the appeal to Gorbachev. Debates on this reedited version start. There are heated calls for a passage on the safety of young Lithuanians serving in the Soviet Armed Forces to be inserted in the appeal.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Appeal Adopted

LD1203151990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1404 GMT on 12 March continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session. Debates on the wording of the appeal to Gorbachev continue. The appeal is put to the vote, including a sentence on the safety of Lithuanians serving in the Armed Forces. It is adopted by 80 votes.

At 1419 GMT, Landsbergis reads out the reedited version of the appeal. It is put to the vote and adopted by 107 votes, with 13 abstentions.

At 1426 GMT, Landsbergis reads out once again a message to Ryzhkov. It is adopted by 118 votes, with two abstentions.

At 1430 GMT, Deputy Cepaitis reads out an appeal to the USSR peoples. There were two versions of this appeal, and both are read. Deputy Antanavicius opposes both versions and asks for them to be returned to the editorial commission for reediting. Landsbergis then reads a version of the appeal reedited by him.

At 1440 GMT, Deputy Sakalas proposes that the version put forward by Landsbergis should be debated. This proposal is put to the vote and accepted. Any proposals to change or amend it will be put forward during the interval.

At 1445 GMT, the session adjourns until 1510 GMT.

Debates Continue, Session Ends

LD1203190490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1513 GMT on 12 March continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The announcer says that the interval was longer than expected and the deputies are only now taking their seats.

At 1518 GMT, an edited version of an appeal to the USSR peoples is read out. 115 deputies are present. The appeal is put to a vote and adopted unanimously.

At 1522 GMT, an appeal to Lithuanian's people is read out. Debates start. The appeal will be rewritten.

At 1541 GMT, an appeal to Lithuania's national communities is read. Debates start on this document. It too will be rewritten.

At 1547 GMT, Deputy Laurinkus reads out an appeal to the USSR president on the presence of Soviet Armed Forces in Lithuania. The deputy also reads the second alternative version of this document.

At 1552 GMT, Deputy Sadreika says that before sending this appeal the problem of serving in the Soviet Armed Forces should be solved. Debates begin on this problem.

At 1624 GMT, it is decided to postpone the adoption of the appeal to the USSR president until tomorrow.

At 1626 GMT, a statement by the Council that the law on service in the Armed Froces is invalid in Lithuania is read.

At 1631 GMT, an edited version of the appeal to the Lithuanian people is read out. Debates on this version continue. There is a lively debate on how to describe Lithuania's neglected countryside. This version is put to a vote.

At 1654 GMT, an appeal to the national communities is read out. It is put to a vote and adopted. A statement on the invalidity of the law on military service is read out. It is put to a vote.

At 1701 GMT, debates continue on recognizing that the laws on military service are invalid in Lithuania. Some amendments are discussed.

At 1715 GMT, a statement by the Union of Riflemen (Sauliu Sajunga) supporting Lithuania's independence is read.

At 1718 GMT, a message is read from the Lithuanian representative in Washington and at the Holy See, Lozoraitis, congratulating the Council.

At 1722 GMT, congratulations from the World Lithuanian Community are read.

At 1724 GMT, greetings from New York artists, American Lithuanians, the Lithuanian Association in Denmark, South Australian Lithuanian Women, the Latvian National Front, Bishop Vincentas Birzgys, and Lech Walesa are read.

At 1730 GMT, debates start on whether the sessions should be televised all the time or only television reportage should be prepared. Television authorities will decide whether to televise the proceedings tomorrow. Debates on various procedural matters continue.

At 1749 GMT, a proposal is received for deputies to continue work in a closed session. This proposal is adopted and deputies continue work in a closed session.

At 1755 GMT, it is decided that an open session will start at 0800 GMT tomorrow.

Chairman Asks Council To Prepare Gorbachev Appeal

LD1203132690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1037 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Remarks by Lithuanian Supreme Council chairman Vytautas Landsbergis to Supreme Council Session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] I would like to draw your attention to a task of great importance which we will have to carry out. Now when we have counted those present at this session we know there is a quorum and, therefore, we can adopt texts of appeals, letters, and so on. Among these, one is indeed of first priority and this should be our official letter to the leader of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev.

You can see some draft letters which have been prepared. These are addressed to the president of the USSR, however, it seems that it is inexpedient for us to wait for a couple of days; we have had the documents adopted yesterday translated into Russian, and they have already been approved for sending as a supplement with the official appeal to the leader of the Soviet Union. During this break we should prepare this text.

Text of Appeal

LD1203151190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1419 GMT 12 Mar 90

["Appeal to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev from Lithuanian Supreme Council" read by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis at the Supreme Council session—live]

[Text] We, the deputies of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, who were elected in democratic and free elections by the people of Lithuania, the people who had been aspiring for decades to restore the statehood of their country, address to you the following statement:

On 11 March 1990 legal acts and political decisions were adopted by the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania which ratified the restoration of the independent state of Lithuania.

Texts of the documents are attached. We hope that you personally and the entire leadership of the USSR will benevolently understand our decisions and that the USSR will recognize the reinstated independent Republic of Lithuania.

We ask you to regard this address to you as our official proposal to the USSR to begin negotiations to settle all issues connected with the restoration of the independent state of Lithuania, which has already been accomplished.

We would like to maintain permanent good political and economic relations with the USSR and we hope that you would take a similar attitude on the matter. We expect benevolence on your part.

We hope that the safety of Lithuanian young men who are currently doing their military service in the Soviet Armed Forces is not in danger.

Council Adopts Appeal

LD1203202690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1930 GMT 12 Mar 90

[TASS Correspondent Kazis Ustsila report]

[Text] Vilnius, 12 Mar (TASS)—The session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet today adopted an address to Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which announces the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state and expresses the hope that the USSR will recognize the independent Lithuanian Republic. The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic requested that the address in question be regarded as an official proposal to the USSR to start talks on regularizing matters connected with the decisions of the legislature of Lithuania, and expressed the desire to maintain good political and economic relations with the USSR.

An address to the USSR Government was also adopted which proposed the maintenance of existing economic ties and mutual obligations prior to the definition of economic relations on the basis of bilateral agreements. The Supreme Soviet adopted an address to the people of Lithuania, and also to the national communities of the Lithuanian Republic.

The legislative documents of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet approved today stated that the USSR law "On Universal Military Service" and also the corresponding articles of the Criminal Code and the Administrative Code of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic which determine the responsibility for violations of the law on military duty are invalid on the territory of Lithuania.

The session commenced the discussion of the matter of the status of enterprises, establishments and organizations subordinate to the Union.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Letter to Ryzhkov

LD1203145790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1341 GMT 12 Mar 90

["Letter of Address" from Lithuanian Supreme Council to Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov, read by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis at the Supreme Council session—live]

[Text] Having restored the state of Lithuania on 11 March 1990, the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania proposes to the Government of the USSR that the existing economic relations and obligations should continue to be observed until economic relations between the Republic of Lithuania and the USSR are established by mutual agreement.

Continuing Ties With USSR, Republics Discussed

LD1203220290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by A. Paulyus, identified by screen caption]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session continued in Vilnius today:

[Paulyus] A group of young people met deputies this morning in the square next to the Supreme Soviet building. [passage omitted] Today we no longer saw the coat of arms of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic next to the entrance to the building. The coat of arms was removed late yesterday after documents were adopted at the session on the rebirth of the Lithuanian State, on its name, and on the coat of arms of the state. [passage omitted] [video shows Lithuanian flag flying at the top of the building; the meeting below and young people holding posters; people looking on as a heroic figure on a horse, painted on canvas, is put into place on an outside wall; and closeups of decrees and laws typed on paper in Russian]

The morning session was mainly devoted to discussing economic problems. [video shows interiors of the session hall; the audience; and people on the rostrum]

[Begin video interview] [Paulyus] Lithuania is connected by thousands of threads with other republics of the Soviet Union. [video shows Paulyus and Kazimiera Prunskiene, acting chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, identified by screen caption, talking together, seated]

[Prunskiene in Russian] Yes, that is so. This can be resolved, these ties, in all manners of ways, that is, as a republic in the composition of the USSR, and as an independent state with other republics located within the composition of the USSR. What was adopted yesterday changes these mutual relations, but does not exclude these current, or future, relations.

Today, for example, we are discussing concrete proposals, and evidently a decision will be adopted on changing the status of enterprises, establishments, and organizations of Union and Union republican subordination that are located in the republic's territory. One can say that this is the real implementation of the law on the economic independence of the Baltic Republics that was adopted in November at the USSR Supreme Soviet, but up to now it was being hampered by actions of the USSR Government. One can say that this law too is being put into effect. At the same time, it states in this decision, which will be adopted today, that troublesome questions on property will be resolved by means of talks with the Government of the Soviet Union. [end video interview]

Lithuania Adopts Decree on Military Service

LD1203234690 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic adopted today two more messages, to the people of Lithuania and ethnic communities. They call for concord, unity and urge the people of Lithuania to rally efforts in order to achieve genuine independence of the republic.

Today the Supreme Council also passed a very important decree abolishing the validity of the Soviet Union's Law on Universal Compulsory Military Service of 12 October (?1957). In the opinion of lawyers, such a supplementary document is necessary not so much for Lithuania, which already declared yesterday that no laws of other states were valid on its territory, as to protect the Lithuanian youth (?renouncing) their military service, although talks have started with the Soviet Union (?on the status) of the Armed Forces. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Supreme Council Issues Appeals

To Peoples of USSR

LD1203165790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1518 GMT 12 Mar 90

["Appeal to the Peoples of the USSR" from Lithuanian Supreme Council issued in Vilnius on 12 March]

[Text] Following the secret agreements of 1939 between Germany and the Soviet Union, the Republic of Lithuania became the victim of USSR aggression and annexation.

The second congress of the USSR People's Deputies, which took place on the 24 December 1989, condemned this as a policy of ultimatum and violation of international treaties. We do not doubt that on the part of the USSR further steps will be taken in the direction of peace and justice.

The process of restructuring and the campaign against the bureaucratic-command system for Lithuania means first of all a struggle for the independence, for historic justice. This has been convincingly proven by the results of the election of deputies of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania elected at these elections declared that on 11 March 1990 that the independent Republic of Lithuania has been reinstated.

We want to achieve the implementation of our independence by peaceful parliamentary means and through international negotiations.

We are sure that we are not violating the interests of any nation. We guarantee equal rights to every nationality living in Lithuania and realization of their nationality and cultural identity.

Freedom, democracy and justice form the basis for good relations with neighbors and for mutual welfare. The 12 July 1920 treaty between Lithuania and Soviet Russia is a historical example of such relations. Let peace, stability and cooperation help to implement the idea of a common European home.

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania appeals to peoples of the USSR, inviting them to understand our benevolent aims and support our aspirations.

To Lithuanian National Communities

LD1303144490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1654 GMT 12 Mar 90

["Appeal" to Lithuania's national communities read at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius on 12 Mar—live]

[Text] [passage indistinct] peaceful life of religious communities in Lithuania recalls the old times of Gediminas and remains up to this day a signpost of wise tolerance. Lithuania is a common homeland for all of us and we have always been victorious when in times of calamity we were united.

On this Lithuanian land we have suffered foreign oppressions for many years, which always become more difficult when our enemies succeed in creating mutual discord.

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, following the continuity of the independent Lithuanian state, invites all national communities in the Republic for fraternal work, the aim of which is to return Lithuania to the family of free and democratic European states, ensure the rights of all Lithuanian citizens and all communities to cultivate their languages, cultures, and customs. We will do everything so that our honest aspirations will meet with approval in the world, that the victory achieved by us does not harm anyone.

To Lithuanians

LD1303150190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1631 GMT 12 Mar 90

["Appeal" to Lithuanian people read at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius on 12 March—live]

[Text] The aspirations of the Lithuanian people have been fulfilled. After bloody lessons of history Lithuania is rising for a bright and just life. Enjoying and greeting it we realize how difficult is our heritage: a collapsing economy, ruined countryside, and urban areas and man himself. As never before we need determination and belief in our strength and desire to see a civilized and highly cultured Lithuania in the honorable community of European nations. Nearsighted mutual squabbles, envy, and the division of people into good and bad according to [passage indistinct], party belonging and nationality, [word indistinct] and skills can be disastrous. [word indistinct] being broken by the merciless

system, misled, set against each other, becoming habitual drunkards, sunken in wickedness, spying, and maliciously accusing each other; we all are the same children of our mother Lithuania. Nobody must be prevented from regeneration, from confessing one's guilt and from returning to the road of honesty.

Independence is not a stern last judgment, not a striving for retribution, not a triumph of the winners, but our uninterrupted way of historical reconciliation, our honor, love, and regeneration.

Landsbergis Views Reaction to Lithuanian Events

LD1203131990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0908 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Speech by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis to Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] And now I would like to inform you about the response, the information, and the impressions on our decisions which we made yesterday and how they were received. [passage omitted] There is much joy in Lithuania today, however we are also aware of the worries which exist. Today the spirit of joy and hope prevails, and I would like this joy and hope, together with the worries, to turn into a spirit of determination and diligence. [passage omitted] It is understandable that dissatisfaction with what we had to do is also expressed in Lithuania today. [passage omitted]

What is the reaction to our political steps outside Lithuania? Probably we will receive texts of official statements, printed statements. So far we have received from Moscow a rather laconic reaction, as far as I can judge, even disinformation about the change of the name of the state and the state emblem. This is what had been received by the time we were handed this information. Perhaps some information has not yet reached me personally.

Some telephone information reached me last night and this morning, naturally among them were greetings from abroad also, greetings from the Lithuanians of the world and their organizations. I was also told about a REUTER report on the statement by Marlin Fitzwater, the White House spokesman. [passage omitted]

I can also acquaint you with the statement of the minister of foreign affairs of Australia which was read to me on the telephone and which has been hurriedly translated. This statement was broadcast by the Australian media. Australia urges the Soviet Union to recognize the newly elected parliament of Lithuania and refrain from creating any restrictions which would lead to a confrontation. G. Evans, Australian minister of foreign affairs, declared in his statement in Canberra that Australia recognizes the resolutions of the freely elected parliament of Lithuania. [passage omitted]

Brazauskas Says Independence Decree Too Hasty

LD1203133490 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Station Commentary]

[Excerpts] The newly elected Lithuanian Parliament has voted to restore the independent state of Lithuania. Our Vilnius correspondent has this report:

[Unidentified correspondent] [passage omitted] On solving procedural issues, the parliament turned to the election of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. There were two names in the ballot—Algirdas Brazauskas, the present president and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party and Dr. Vytautas Landsbergis, 57, a Vilnius Conservatoire professor. The vast majority of the parliamentarians cast their votes for Landsbergis. [passage omitted]

Following the election of the Supreme Soviet chairman, the parliamentarians debated and approved a series of bills. One was passed by an overwhelming majority—the bill on restoration of the Lithuanian statehood. The lawmakers dropped the words "Soviet" and "Socialist" from the name of the Lithuanian republic. They abolished the use in Lithuania of the Soviet Constitution and the Constitution of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. A provisional fundamental law was adopted underpinned by Lithuania's constitution of 1938. The parliament is going to make an appeal to the future Soviet president on the issue of Soviet troops in Lithuania.

In his first speech as the Lithuanian president, Vytautas Landsbergis, called for a strong coalition government. He proposed that work begin without delay on Lithuania's economic policies, admitting that Sajudis had to finalize its economic program. Later he told newsmen he had asked Western governments to recognize the new Lithuania.

The Lithuanian communist leader, Brazauskas, has said the decision to go independent was taken in defiance of Moscow's appeal to wait until the end of the Congress of People's Deputies, the Soviet Union's supreme authority, which opens today. Brazauskas said he has refused to become one of Lithuania's three vice presidents.

Gorbachev Aide Urges Political Solutions

LD1203163890 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] The newly elected parliament of Lithuania at it first session on Sunday approved an act restoring an independent Lithuania. Joining the Soviet Union in 1940 has been described as (?inpingement) of an alien force on the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian state.

An assistant to the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, a people's deputy of the USSR, Georgiy

Shakhnazarov, said the Lithuanian parliament had clearly made too much haste when declaring the independence of the republic. In an interview for the independent information service INTERFAX, he said he doesn't know what the reaction of the country's leadership will be to the step taken by Vilnius, but in his opinion it is necessary to act only by political means. Military force is not needed, he said.

Landsbergis Hopeful of Ties With Czechoslovakia

LD1203180690 Prague CTK in English 1625 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius March 12 (CTK)—"I hope that Czechoslovakia with which we maintain traditionally friendly relations, and which developed political and cultural contacts with pre-war independent Lithuania, will be one of the first countries to cooperate fruitfully with free Lithuania", newly elected Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic Vitautas Landsbergis told journalists here Monday.

He added that from the present contacts with the new Czechoslovak leadership he has got an impression that Lithuania can expect help from Czechoslovakia earlier than from any other country.

Vilnius Radio Carries 11 Mar Supreme Soviet

Chairman Candidates Nominated

LD1103085190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service at 0700 GMT on 11 March begins live coverage from the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius. Reception is fair to unmonitorable.

At 0700 GMT the session opens; 129 deputies in attendance.

At 0705 GMT the mandate commission reports that 133 deputies have been elected. It is noted that 71.71 percent of the electors participated in the first round elections; 66.4 percent participated in the second round. The names of all deputies present are read.

At 0720 GMT Deputy Sakalas proposes quoting a decision confirming the mandates of the elected deputies. This decision is adopted unanimously.

At 0722 GMT Deputy Aleksandras Abisalas summarizes the proposals to introduce amendments to the procedure of electing the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Debates on this issue took place. At this point reception deteriorates. The amendments are adopted unanimously.

Reception returns to unmonitorable at 0755 GMT.

At 0757 GMT the nomination of candidates to the post of the Supreme Soviet chairman is about to start. The following candidates were nominated: Romualdas Ozolas, Vytautas Landsbergis. Reception returns to unmonitorable. Algirdas Brazauskas was also nominated as a candidate. Several deputies spoke in support of these candidates. A deputy then proposes the election of Kazimieras Motieka to this post. Only Algirdas Brazauskas and Vytautas Landsbergis agreed to stand for the elections.

At 0825 GMT the session adjourns.

Brazauskas Speaks

LD1103112190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0853 GMT on 11 March resumes live coverage from the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius.

The Lithuanian radio announcer reminds listeners the four candidates nominated for the post of Supreme Soviet chairman are R. Ozolas, V. Landsbergis, A. Brazauskas, and K. Motieka. He notes that Motieka and Ozolas withdrew their candidacies, leaving Landsbergis and Brazauskas as the remaining candidates for chairman.

At 0859 GMT the candidates are told to present their platforms.

At 0901 GMT Algirdas Brazauskas begins his speech. Mentioning the importance of the occasion and that of the post, he thanks those who proposed him to the post. He describes his view on the post and the future role of the chairman in the process of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Brazauskas concludes his speech at 0911 GMT.

At 0912 GMT A. Sakalas asks A. Brazauskas if independence should be declared now, and only then should strengthening of the economy and negotiations with the USSR begin. A. Brazauskas says he thinks this work must be carried out in parallel, at the same time.

Another deputy asks when both candidates think the USSR People's Deputies from Lithuania should be recalled from Moscow. A. Brazauskas said these deputies should carry on working and taking part in the negotiations. Asked why he had tolerated the inertia of the government concerning the restructuring of the economy and fighting the economic blockade Brazauskas says that time was too short to form a new Council of Ministers; there are only four months left until the elections. The Government of the Soviet Union is doing everything to consolidate the unitarian state and would do everything possible to keep Lithuania in the USSR, he says.

K. Motieka asks what A. Brazauskas thinks of this. A. Brazauskas agrees it is a very complex issue but he believes there will be some support in the USSR Supreme Soviet because of other republics are also striving for the same or similar goal.

A. Brazauskas agrees the negotiations on the status of the Soviet Armed Forces should start with the preamble that the Soviet Armed Forces had been an army of occupation for 50 years in this republic.

B. Rupeika asks what A. Brazauskas would do as chairman if Moscow refused to hold any negotiations concerning Lithuania's independence. Brazauskas says that conditions for negotiations should be created in such a way that negotiations would become inevitable.

At 0941 GMT a deputy from Alytus asked if Brazauskas would resign as first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party if he were elected as Supreme Soviet chairman. Brazauskas says he thinks the post in question requires political impartiality, therefore, he thinks he will probably have to be released from his post by an extraordinary congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

At 0946 GMT the questions posed to Brazauskas conclude.

Landsbergis Speaks

LD1103123190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0947 GMT on 11 March continues its live coverage from the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius.

At 0947 GMT Vytautas Landsbergis, candidate for Lithuanian Supreme Soviet chairman, begins his speech to the session. Landsbergis describes his platform, saying it is the same as adopted by Sajudis. He concludes his speech at 0952 GMT.

At 0953 GMT questions are put to Landsbergis. The first question asks if he would give up the post of the chairman of the Sajudis Seimas Council; he replies he will do so. Landsbergis says he would not like to go to Moscow as the USSR People's Deputy after Lithuania becomes independent.

A deputy from the Polish minority asks Landsbergis what is his attitude on nationality minorities in Lithuania and if Polish people will be given the opppportunity to receive higher education in the Polish language. Landsbergis says he would be an advocate for concord among nationalities, and he would like to see everyone living in this republic happy and a patriot of Lithuania. He says he does not think setting up Polish universities here in Lithuania was a good idea, however, he believes Poles in Lithuania could get their education in the neighboring fraternal Poland.

B. Rupeika asks if Sajudis will become a party. Landsbergis says that it is true the dividing line between Sajudis and other parties is not clearly visible at this moment. He says the political forces will be distributed in this parliament not according differences in their platforms, but rather according to the resoluteness or cautiousness in the implementation of their platform demands.

At 1020 GMT the questions continue. Questions concerning Landsbergis' health, his future deputy, his point of view on the overwhelming popularity of A. Brazauskas and many other questions are put. Reception deteriorates to poor at this point.

At 1047 GMT the session adjourns for 10 minutes.

At 1105 GMT live coverage resumes. It was announced that ballots have been already prepared and that the vote will be held after the debates. It was announced that 89 press agencies and news companies from all over the world had sent their journalists to Lithuania. The time limit for speeches during the debates was set at three minutes.

At 1118 GMT Mecys Laurinkus takes the floor. He expresses his support to Sajudis and to V. Landsbergis because, he says, it was Sajudis who initiated the movement for independence.

At 1122 GMT another deputy says the party which lost elections in practical terms could not take up the most important posts in the administration of this republic. Most deputies support V. Landsbergis, saying that collection of signatures in support of Brazauskas especially in Klaipeda was carried out by the same group of people who currently were collecting signatures again demanding the unification of Klaipeda with the Kaliningrad Oblast.

At 1150 GMT the debates conclude

At 1151 GMT Brazauskas takes the floor for his final speech. Reception remains poor. He thanks his supporters and says that he personally did not organize any action of signature collection. Brazauskas reminds them it was he who made this brave decision to go for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party, therefore he dismisses accusations claiming him to be cautious.

At 1156 GMT V. Landsbergis takes the floor. He says it is up to the deputies to decide who will become their chairman.

At 1157 GMT procedures of the election are explained: Ballots given to a deputy must be signed by the deputy, and following this it will be stamped. After that the deputy will delete one of the two names. The election results will be known after the break, when the session resumes work at about 1330 GMT.

Landsbergis Elected

LD1103134890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1330 GMT 11 March resumes its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius. Reception is fair.

A vote is taken on the chairmanship of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

At 1340 GMT Vytautas Landsbergis is elected chairman.

Further on Vote

LD1103150290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1340 GMT on 11 March continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Session in Vilnius. Reception is fair.

Deputy Saulius Razma reads the results of the vote counting commission, noting, I am going to read the protocol of the meeting of the Vote Counting Commission, 11 March 1990. The meeting was attended by Chairman Saulius Razma, Secretary Gediminas Serksnys, members of the commission Kumza, Sejunas, and Baranauskas. The commission examined the results of secret voting in the elections of the chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet:

133 deputies were elected to the Supreme Soviet, 133 deputies were taking part in the 1st session of the 12th convocation. The voting papers in secret voting contained the candidatures of Algirdas Brazauskas and Vytautas Landsbergis, One hundred thirty three papers were distributed for secret voting. After the opening of the urn, 133 papers were found. There were no invalid papers. After counting the result, it was established that the candidates obtained the votes as follows: Algirdas Brazauskas—38 for, 95 against; Vytautas Landsbergis—91 for and 42 against. According to the procedural regulation of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet 2, the second subsection, Vytautas Landsbergis was elected chariman of the lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

Declaration Read

LD1103155390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1512 GMT on 11 March in its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session carries a 5-minute declaration on the status of Lithuania as a republic read by Vytatus Landsbergis. Reception is poor.

Session Agenda Adopted

LD1103165290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1423 GMT on 11 March continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius with Landsbergis proposing for the post of secretary of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Liudvikas Sabutis, who already holds this post. 125 deputies vote in favor, two abstain, and there are zero votes against.

At 1430 GMT Landsbergis reads the proposed agenda for the session:

"I am going now to read the agenda:

"The next item on the agenda will be a statement by the Lithuanian Council of Ministers on the termination of the mandate. Then there will be a declaration on the mandates of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputies. This will be followed by a draft law on changing the name of the state and the state coat of arms. Then a draft law on the restoration of the Lithuanian state, which is also linked with other documents.

"There is a question of the status of the USSR people's deputies elected in Lithuania, and two constitutional drafts.

"It is envisaged to adopt an appeal, as it is stated here, to all Lithuania's people, all USSR peoples and the peoples of the world, to Lithuania's national communities, and to the USSR president. This, so to say, is in advance, because there is as yet no such president.

"Undoubtedly the work load is great. This item will not come today, but when we discuss this appeal there will be a USSR president.

"There are also questions on changing the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic law on the status of the former state organs of the union-republican subordination, and the formation of working groups of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. We will also examine a draft law on the republican government and the proposals to appoint the prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic and a draft law on the structure of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

"This is to be accomplished by our session, which will take a long time, will be hard work, and full of content. I propose to you to confirm this agenda.

The agenda is confirmed.

At 1438 GMT a letter from Vytautas Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, declares that the mandates given by the Supreme Soviet have now been terminated and, therefore, the session of the Supreme Soviet is expected to appoint a new government. K. Prunskiene is offered the post of prime minister on a temporary basis until the prime minister is elected. She accepts the post, and the deputies vote in favor.

At 1457 GMT reception becomes unmonitorable until 1506 GMT, when a vote is taken on the proposal that the declaration be discussed immediately, and that the work of the session be adjourned. It was decided to continue the session.

At 1512 GMT the text of the declaration is read by Vytautas Landsbergis.

At 1517 GMT a vote is taken on the declaration; voting is by name.

At 1523 GMT the session adjourns for 15 minutes

Name Change Adopted

LD1103183490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1543 GMT on 11 March resumes its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius. Reception is poor.

It is announced that Vytautas Landsbergis went to see the people who gathered outside the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet building and made a short speech.

At 1545 GMT the results of the ballots on the mandates of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) Supreme Soviet deputies are given.

At 1549 GMT the names of deputies are read out and it is indicated how they voted, for or against. Six deputies abstained. The majority voted in favor, hence the declaration was adopted.

At 1558 GMT Landsbergis reads a document on the name of the Lithuanian SSR and it coat of arms.

"A draft law of the Lithuanian Supreme Council on the name of the state and its coat of arms:

"Advancing to the state's independent life which is being restored, seeing in the official name and emblems a great spiritual and political significance, and being empowered by the will of the Lithuanian citizens and electors, the Lithuanian Supreme council resolves:

"1. In the Constitution and other legal acts to use the only official name of the state: The Lithuanian Republic, and more briefly and in composite names, Lithuania, of Lithuania.

"2. To continue to use the official state coat of arms and emblem of the Lithuanian Republic—Vytis.

"3. To call the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic.

"4. To call the post of chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet the post of chairman of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic.

"5. To call all further acts of this Supreme Council the acts of the Supreme council of the Lithuanian Repubic of the first convocation.

"6. In accordance with Article One of this law to change the names of the state bodies.

"7. This law comes into force from the moment of its adoption."

At 1605 GMT a vote was taken and the name of Lithuanian SSR was changed to the Republic of Lithuania. It became valid the moment it was adopted. Reception then deteriorates until 1613 GMT.

Other Changes Discussed

LD1103190790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1613 GMT on 11 March continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius. Reception is poor.

Vytautas Lansbergis congratulates everybody for putting the damage right.

At 1620 GMT Ceslovas Stankevicius deputy chairman of the Supreme Council, takes the floor and gives a report on the restoration of Lithuania's statehood.

At 1622 GMT Stankevicius declares that the statehood of Lithuania, which was destroyed by the Soviet occupation, has now been restored. Stankevicius then reads another document on the reinstatement of the Lithuanian Constitution of 1938.

"The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, expressing the will of the people, has decided and now solemnly declares that the execution of sovereign powers, which were restrained by foreign powers in 1940, has been reinstated.

"The Act of Lithuanian Independence of 16 February 1918, declared by the Council of Lithuania as well as the resolution of the Lithuanian Constituent Seimas on 15 May 1920 on the reinstatement of the democratic state of Lithuanian has never been abolished. These documents are fully valid and form the constitutional basis of the state of Lithuania. The territory of Lithuania is integral and indivisible. The constitution of any other state is not valid on the territory of Lithuania.

"Human rights, the rights of citizens and those of national communities are guaranteed by the state of Lithuania. The state of Lithuania recognizes the principle of the inviolability of borders as recognized by the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

"The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, as the implementer of sovereign powers, will start implementing the entire sovereignty of the state."

"Another document of concern is the law of the Lithuanian Republic on reinstating the validity of the 12 May 1938 Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania.

"The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, confirming the decision of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet adopted on 7 February 1990—on eliminating the consequences to Lithuania of the 1939 treaties between Germany and the USSR—declares that the validity of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania of 12 May 1938 was illegally terminated when the USSR carried out an aggression on 15 June 1940 against the sovereign state of Lithuania. As a result, Lithuania was annexed. The People's Seimas of 21 July, as the tool for exerting the will of a foreign country, and decisions adopted by it, are illegal. Aspiring to restore the violated rights of the

nation and those of the state of Lithuania, the Lithuanian Supreme Council decides:

"1. To terminate the validity of the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR of 20 April 1978.

"2. To terminate the application of the USSR Constitution of 7 October 1978, as well as the application of the basic laws of the USSR and the Union republics on the territory of the Republic of Lithuania.

"3. To reinstate the validity of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania of 12 May 1938 on the entire territory of the Republic of Lithuania, cancelling the validity of those articles of the constitution which regulate the status of the president of the republic, the Seimas, the State Council, and the state auditor."

At 1632 GMT the Provisional Main Law of Lithuania is read. Stankevicius says that this provisional main law was set up to solve current constitutional problems.

At 1637 GMT Stankevicius speaks about the future constitution of the Republic of Lithuania.

Greetings Conveyed

LD1103210590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1645 GMT on 11 March continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius.

Deputy Chairman Stankevicius winds up his remarks on the Constitution.

At 1647 GMT questions on this topic and debates take place.

At 1659 GMT a commission to deal with this issue is formed.

At 1700 GMT the session is adjourned for 15 minutes.

At 1715 GMT reception becomes unmonitorable.

At 1730 GMT an unidentified deputy, stating that he is of Polish nationality, supports all the decisions and resolutions of this new Lithuanian supreme state authority.

At 1732 GMT an unidentified deputy complains that Polish- speaking representatives have not been invited to examine changes in the laws. He supports Algirdas Brazauskas' opinion that all changes should take place gradually. He intends to abstain from voting.

At 1739 GMT reception suddenly deteriorates and becomes unmonitorable.

At 1741 GMT debates on amendments to the temporary main law continue. Chairman Landsbergis proposes that the commission examine all the proposed amendments and then, in a week's time, return to the Supreme Council for debates. Landsbergis proposes that a speaker of this new Lithuanian supreme authority be elected, but then says this question can be left for consideration tomorrow.

At 1820 GMT an official of a local authority, not a deputy, is allowed to make a proposal that the term of office for local officials be extended.

At 1826 GMT Landsbergis, on behalf of the Supreme Council, greets writer Justinas Marcinkevicius. Zbigniew Bujak, member of the Polish Sejm, greets the Supreme Council in Polish, especially mentioning Landsbergis, who Bujak knows from encounters with him in Poland. Bujak assures them that the Polish people cherish friendly feelings toward Lithuania. The Polish people are waging a similar struggle for their rights and they sympathize with the Lithuanian people. Bujak stresses that Poland respects postwar borders. He finishes his speech in Lithuanian saying: "Let God help you."

At 1831 GMT greetings are read from Juozas Urbsys, former Lithuanian minister of foreign affairs in independent Lithuania, and Sergey Kovalev, a representative from Russia, who finishes his speech with the words: "Your freedom is our freedom." Following this, facts are given about S. Kovalev, who says he is the one who helped spread illegal publications distributed in Lithuania.

At 1846 GMT (Lev Semayev), candidate Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy, conveys greetings from G. Popov and Y. Afanasyev, chairmen of the Interregional Group of Deputies, as well as from the the Association of the Moscow Voters and the Association for the Defense of Gdlyan and Ivanov, saying that a historic event took place today in Lithuania.

"Allow us to congratulate all the citizens of Lithuania on the occasion of the independent, sovereign, and free Lithuania." [applause]

"We Russians are sincerely filled with joy together with you today over the events we are happy to witness. Indeed, a historic event took place today; the dream of many nations has come true. An irreversible process of disintegration of the so-called indissoluble union of the unfree republic has begun. [applause]

"Of course, such peoples deputies as Ryzhkov, Samsonov, Lukyanov, Ligachev, and unfortunately Gorbachev, too, would not send you greetings today. Therefore, I have been entrusted with one more mission from Gavriil Popov and Yuriy Afanasyev to urge you, and specifically the USSR people's deputies from Lithuania, to take an active part tomorrow in the so-called extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, which will probably demonstrate tomorrow a unique example in the world's life—introduction of the so-called rule of the president."

"Only your help rendered to other radical forces at the congress can, to some extent, impede those who are desperate to preserve monopoly rule over our destinies

with the help of the so-called mad and irresponsible-looking destinies of their people, the Tatar-Mongolian majority. With their help they will legalize their rule over us for many years to come.

"Therefore, I would like to conclude with the words: It is not only our freedom and yours. Our fight for your freedom and ours can ensure a humane future for our children and grandchildren and yours. Long live and flourish the new independent and free Republic of Lithuania. Thank you."

At 1854 GMT a member of the Czechoslovak forum conveys his greetings in Russian, stressing that at present the name of Lithuania is known all over Czecholovakia.

At 1857 GMT a representative of the Kaliningrad Solidarity, Yelena Koltsova, states that people in Kaliningrad Oblast are very proud of their neighbor who is not afraid to stand up in defense of its rights. She expects relations between Kaliningrad and Lithuania not to cease in the present situation.

At 1858 GMT Landsbergis states that there are also representatives from Belorussia, Latvia, and Estonia present. The Estonian representative conveys greetings.

At 1905 GMT the session is adjourned for 10 minutes.

Landsbergis Reads Appeal to World

LD1103222190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1928 GMT on 11 March continues its live coverage of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius. Reception is poor.

The radio announcer says a news conference will take place after the end of today's session.

At 1932 GMT the chairman starts addressing the session. Reception becomes unmonitorable.

At 1936 GMT the chairman reads the act on restoration of the Lithuanian state and reads other documents transcribed previously that will now be put to a vote. Amendments to the provisional constitution are read.

At 1954 GMT the problem arises of whether a Lithuanian citizen can be a deputy in two councils. Reception again becomes unmonitorable.

At 2002 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes that the provisional constitution be carried at once in the press and on radio and television.

At 2008 GMT a vote by name on the act on restoration of the Lithuanian state is taken. The title of this act is: "The Act of the Lithuanian Supreme Council on the Restoration of the Lithuanian Independent State."

At 2016 GMT while the votes are being counted, it is decided to confirm the provisional main law article-by-article.

At 2019 GMT the draft law on changing the status of the state bodies under union-republican subordination is considered. The draft law provides for these bodies to be subordinated only to the Lithuanian Republic. A similar draft law applies to enterprises on the republic's territory. Proposals are made to introduce amendments to this draft law.

At 2033 GMT Landsbergis proposes that the session resume its work tomorrow at 1100 (0900 GMT). After a brief discussion it is decided to start work tomorrow at 1100.

At 2036 GMT the chairman reads the names of deputies who voted for the act of restoration of the independent Lithuanian state. 124 deputies voted for the act, four abstained, and three did not take part. There were no votes against. Landsbergis says: "I congratulate the deputies; I congratulate Lithuania." The results of the vote are greeted with applause and the singing of the state anthem.

At 2046 GMT those present in the hall chant: "Lietuva, Lietuva" (Lithuania, Lithuania).

At 2049 GMT Landsbergis says: "Lithuania is already free." Then those present chant that Latvia and Estonia will be free too.

At 2051 GMT a proposal is made by the deputy that this act be signed by all those taking part in the voting.

At 2054 GMT a vote is taken on the draft law of the Lithuanian Republic terminating the validity of various laws in the former Lithuanian SSR. The law is passed.

At 2103 GMT the provisional main law is adopted by a majority of votes. The law confirming the Provisional Main Law of the Republic of Lithuania is passed.

At 2107 GMT a resolution of the Lithuanian Supreme Council on all former state bodies under the union-republican subordination being now subordinated to the republic only is considered. The resolution is adopted.

At 2113 GMT an appeal to the nations of the world is read out by Vytautas Landsbergis: "Appeal of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania to the nations of the world.

"The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, having declared the continuity of the independent state of Lithuania and its return to the family of free countries of the world, is expecting their fraternal solidarity and support.

"Our decision is not directed against any state or any nationality living here in Lithuania. This is the path that allows us to ensure the rights of man, citizens, and nationality communities here in Lithuania, to open up to unimpeded communication, and to make a responsible contribution and work for world justice and peace, which is in the process of being established. Let God and all the people of goodwill help us."

The appeal is adopted.

At 2121 GMT it is decided to send a message from Lithuania to the people's deputies in Moscow asking them to inform the session about the Supreme Council's decisions.

At 2129 GMT the session is adjourned until tomorrow at 0900 GMT and live coverage ends.

Supreme Council Issues Act on Independence

LD1203173390 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Mar 90

["Text" of act of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania on restoration of the independent Lithuanian state issued in Vilnius on 11 March]

[Text] Act of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania on restoration of the independent Lithuanian State:

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, expressing the will of the nation, resolves and solemnly proclaims that the execution of the sovereign power of the Lithuanian state, constrained heretofore by alien forces since 1940, is restored. The 16 February 1918 act of independence of the Supreme Council of Lithuania and the 15 May 1920 Constituent Assembly resolution on the restoration of a democratic Lithuanian State have never lost their legal force. They have full power and are the constitutional foundation of the Lithuanian State.

The territory of Lithuania is integral and indivisible and the constitution of any other state has no jurisdiction within it.

The Lithuanian state guarantees the rights of individuals, citizens and ethnic communities residing therein, and recognizes the principle of the inviolability of borders as formulated in Helsinki in 1975 in the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, expressing sovereign power, undertakes hereforth the implementation of the state's full sovereignty.

Polish Parliamentarians Congratulate Lithuania

LD1203012690 Warsaw PAP in English 2240 GMT 11 Mar 90

[By PAP correspondent Miroslaw Ikonowicz]

[Text] Vilnius, March 11—The new Lithuanian Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution on changing the Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania into the Republic of Lithuania and a declaration on restoring the country's sovereignty.

The Supreme Council of Lithuania elected Wytauskas Landsbergis—the to-date chairman of Sajudis—its chairman.

The first foreign guest whom Landsbergis gave the floor to was Polish Senator Tadeusz Klopotowski who arrived from Warsaw along with Sejm Deputy Henryk Wujec.

Speaking in the name of the citizens' parliamentary floor group, Senator Klopotowski relayed congratulations and expressions of admiration and respect for the Lithuanian nation, addressed to "all deputies, irrespectively of their political views and nationality."

The senator recalled the message to the Soviet nations, Lithuanians inclusive, addressed by the Solidarnosc Congress in 1981. Summing up, Klopotowski stressed that Poland respected all borders and awaited that others would do the same.

Landsbergis—who also replied to questions put by the Polish parliamentarians—stressed friendly relations between new Lithuania and new Poland.

Western Republics

Nationalists Urge Independence Party in Ukraine

AU1203161690 Paris AFP in English 1451 GMT 12 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 12 (AFP)—Leaders of the powerful Ukrainian nationalist movement have called for the creation of a party seeking independence for the Ukraine, the Soviet Union's second largest republic after Russia, a Radio Moscow publication reported Monday.

INTERFAX said the leaders of the Ukrainian movement known as Rukh justified the proposal because the Soviet Communist Party had "failed to ensure an ethnic, social and cultural equality" in the country.

In its appeal, Rukh denounced the party's "imperial ambitions" and dismissed Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's offer of a "renewed federation" as "hypocritical".

The Ukrainian nationalists also called on the Ukrainian Communist Party to break with the central party in Moscow, following the example of Lithuanian communists, according to INTERFAX.

The Ukrainian nationalists' call for a pro-independence party comes after Sunday's vote by the Lithuanian parliament which proclaimed the Baltic state—independent between the two world wars—to be independent of the Soviet Union.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on Monday described the Lithuanian decision as "rather alarming".

INTERFAX said that at a rally in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital, on Sunday, participants had shouted "deeply anticommunist slogans".

Rukh candidates did well in the March 4 elections, notably in western Ukraine. The republic has a total population of 51 million.

Ukrainian Trade Union Paper To Be Published

LD0903214890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 9 Mar 90

[Text] A trade-union newspaper VOICE OF THE WORKING PEOPLE [GOLOS TRUDYASHCHIKHSYA] will begin publication in the Ukraine in the middle of this year. At the same time, supplements to the oblast papers in Zhitomir and Odessa will be published in Polish, Moldavian, and Russian.

Ukrainian Religious Paper Published

LD0803200790 Kiev in Ukrainian to Europe 1800 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] "Stop committing misfortunes, learn doing good deeds"—with this quote from the Bible, Archbishop Lazar opens his appeal to the readers of Ukraine's first eparchial newspaper. This is the first eparchial publication in Ukrainian within the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which was recently instituted by decision of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. The paper is called YEPARKHIALNY VISNYK [EPARCHIAL HERALD], and is intended for believers of the Ternopol eparchy. Its print-run will be 30,000 copies, and will appear twice a month.

Donetsk Rally Addresses Current Issues

PM2802095590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent report: "Response—IZVESTIYA No 56: A Minute's Silence"]

[Text] Donetsk—The rally began at the exact time scheduled—precisely at midday, and in the very place where the strike committee members and the leadership of the Donetsk voters' union had asked for it to begin. Over 5,000 people gathered on the square outside the oblast party committee [obkom] and oblast soviet executive committee building [oblispolkom].

Aleksandr Kolomiytsev, cochairman of the Donetsk strike committee, called for a minute's silence in memory of the 13 Makeyevka miners who died the day before. "A Minute's Silence" is precisely the title of IZVESTIYA's report, which met with complete understanding and approval, judging by the numerous responses and speeches at the rally. After all, it talks not just about the current situation in the Donbass but also about how to find a way out of the crisis that has come about, about how to learn, not just to listen but to hear one another.

"Perestroyka is a revolution," Ivan Zbykovskiy, USSR people's deputy, said in his speech, "and it must go deep, it must transfer real power into the hands of the soviets, but do so in an exclusively peaceful way, and not through social excesses. By participating in the elections the people must resolve the power question actively and consciously. All efforts must be aimed at this, and today's edition of IZVESTIYA does indeed write about this." These were Zbykovskiy's concluding words in his speech at the rally.

The participants in the rally spoke about everything—they spoke frankly about all problems. And in many speeches there were constant references to the previous edition of our newspaper, and the consolidation of all the Donbass' constructive forces was stressed. And people did not just talk, they also listened to other people, maybe for the first time during genuine glasnost. USSR People's Deputy A. Boyko convincingly justified the need to sit down at a roundtable and have a social dialogue and reach agreement on all burning issues.

Over 50 people stood in line for the microphone. They included obkom party secretaries, people's deputies, candidate people's deputies, and—most importantly—miners and working people who are now in solidarity with perestroyka and want the stabilization of the situation both in the Donbass and throughout the country.